

THE
ECLECTIC REVIEW,

FOR JUNE, 1838.

Art. I. 1. *Commentaries on the Life and Reign of Charles the First, King of England.* By J. D'ISRAELI. 5 vols. 8vo. London, 1828—1831.

2. *Eminent British Statesmen.* By JOHN FORSTER, Esq., of the Inner Temple. 3 vols. (Lardner's Cyclopædia). Longman and Co. London: 1834—1838.

ON few subjects have the men of recent times differed more widely, than in the judgment they have formed concerning the spirit and measures of the leaders in the memorable struggle during the reign of Charles the First. All parties, however, have been pretty well agreed in describing the principal actors in those times as extraordinary men, and as having brought a genius of the highest order to the great questions of social policy. This concession has been made to the intelligence of many among the royalists; and the force of prejudice, or a mistaken sense of honour, without any mention of less reputable causes, has been deemed sufficient to account for the course which they pursued. On the popular leaders, similar praise has been bestowed by some of their most determined opponents; sometimes, with every appearance of ingenuousness, but, frequently, it would seem, for the purpose of impugning their integrity with greater effect, or in the hope of making it appear, that strong popular principles of government, having received their full trial in such hands, and signally failed, should henceforth be regarded with the deepest mistrust by every wise man, under any possible management. But we have not now to do with the motives of such concessions. Our present business is with the fact that they are made, and with the certainty that they would not have been made so generally, had not the history of those times been such as to give them the appearance of truth. Not that weak minds

were wanting in that age either in matters of policy or religion, any more than our own. The supply of great men was more remarkable than in any preceding period of our history; but the causes which contributed to so much excellence in some quarters, tended to produce extravagance, and almost every conceivable absurdity in others. In short, the generation then existing, discovered a marvellous aptitude for reviving and invigorating both the wisdom and the folly of all bygone times.

It is sad doing, however, when we attempt to ascertain the ground on which the more favourable judgment with regard to the men of those times has been formed, and possess no better guide than is afforded by our popular histories. It is true, when death puts an end to the career of conspicuous personages, we are, perhaps, favoured with a description of their character, set forth after the most approved method, and with sufficient marks of elaboration. But the man who has learnt to regard just and satisfactory views on such matters as important, and who happens to be so ill-starred as to find himself incapable of trusting to the accuracy of these commonly received representations, is a person not without some claim on our pity? The facts regarded by the historian as justifying the exhibition in the way of portraiture which he has furnished, are, in general, but very imperfectly given; and are presented, moreover, so much in the shape of fragments, scattered over a large surface—after the encyclopædia fashion—that the difficulty of forming any clear and decided judgment is truly perplexing. And this perplexity becomes, in many cases, utter hopelessness, when to the difficulty arising from the want of available information, we add that which is produced by the venom of partizanship, which can always impart its colourings to the delineations of character with much greater impunity than to the statement of facts. Even to compare the accounts of opposite partisans is not always to make any manifest progress in the way toward certainty. Hence, very often—we may perhaps say in the majority of instances—the only path to that kind of knowledge which every sober man must deem necessary to confidence of judgment, is through the tedious labour of examining and comparing original authorities.

It has accordingly sometimes occurred to us, that we have hardly a greater want than a good biographical history of the reign of Charles the First—a history, we mean, which should present the great men of that age in a series, bringing out the features of character in each by means of the concentrated light to be derived from the facts which belong to their history. Not such lengthy and ill-managed compilations as those of Doctor Harris, 'after the manner of Bayle,' nor such slight patchwork as Mr. D'Israeli has produced, after the manner of himself. We want a sufficiency of consecutive fact to supply the compressed spirit of

individual history, and thus to enable the general reader to form his own conclusions. We have no hope of seeing this done without something like the usual manifestation of party bias. But a work on such a plan would carry with it the strongest check that could be brought to bear on tendencies of that nature. Such a work might be allowed to supersede some of our histories altogether, and would serve as a valuable supplement even to the best of them. Our limits must of course preclude us from doing any thing like justice to such a subject, but the rapid glance we mean to bestow upon it may not be altogether uninteresting, and at least may tend to indicate the kind of interest and value that might be given to it.

Were we disposed to take up Mr. D'Israeli's volumes in the way of regular analysis and comment, it would not be difficult to show that there is scarcely a page in them which does not betray his incompetency to the work which his ambition has disposed him to undertake. We admit that he is an amusing writer, and that there are few chapters in these 'Commentaries' which do not contain matters of fact or of observation sufficient to prevent the time consumed in reading them from being altogether lost. But what is new in the way of fact is so inconsiderable when compared with what is old, often very old; and what is sound as matter of observation, is so constantly in juxtaposition with the frivolous, the pedantic, and the absurd, that a reviewer disposed to furnish his readers with merriment at the cost of an author's reputation, could hardly desire a work more to his purpose than is furnished in the five volumes which Mr. D'Israeli has given to the world with so much manifest complacency. We believe our author has published an essay on the character of James I. a person remarkable for stealing good sayings from books, and supplying bad ones from his own brain, and there is so much of this sort of inconsistency in the sayings of Mr. D'Israeli, as almost to force upon us the suspicion that the same cause has had something to do with the result in both cases. Mr. D'Israeli has often to express his pity toward his opponents, as lamentably deficient in impartiality, in a philosophic spirit, or in logical power and acuteness, and this he does with a wonderful mixture of authority and condescension; but unhappily our language could hardly furnish more striking specimens of precisely the same faults than may be found in the disquisitions of the author himself, and, perhaps, at the very page where a lament of this sort over the supposed infirmity of others has been obtruded on us.

The attack made by Mr. D'Israeli on the fair fame of the patriots who flourished during the early days of the long parliament, and, especially, on the memory of Sir John Eliot, has led Mr. Forster to a closer examination of the history of these great men than had been hitherto bestowed upon it; and the series of memoirs which he has published is highly creditable to his

industry, his ability, and, upon the whole, to his impartiality. His style, like that of his opponent, has no regularity or fixedness, resembling clever talk, more than the finished tone of composition that might have been well bestowed on such a subject. But his manner of pursuing his object, reminds us of Mr. D'Israeli only by way of contrast, the latter being ever liable to be drawn aside by the most trivial matters that may chance to cross his path, the former prosecuting his course with a continuity of purpose which nothing is suffered to disturb.

The reign of Charles the First, viewed in reference to the character of its leading men, may be divided into four parts; the first, embracing the interval to the death of Buckingham; the second, commencing in 1628, and terminating with the meeting of the Long Parliament in 1640; the third, ending with the death of Strafford and the removal of the court to York, in 1642; and the last with the death of the king. During the first of these intervals, the government was in the hands of Buckingham, Laud, Weston, Finch, Coventry, Winderbanke, Cooke, Carleton, and some others, all being, more or less, the creatures of the favourite, and men to whom the great majority of the commons in three successive Parliaments opposed themselves with immovable determination. Subsequently, the court party was strengthened by accessions from the ranks of the patriots, obtained by holding out the allurements of court favour. Among the flexible lovers of their country with whom those overtures were successful, we have to reckon Lord Saville, Sir Dudley Digges, Littleton, Noy, and Wentworth. With the meeting of the Long Parliament, in 1640, we witness the ascendancy of the patriotic party, and the rapid progress of retribution and reformation to the death of Strafford. From that time a number of leading men in both houses began to look on the freedom of the ancient constitution as more in danger from the real or supposed excesses of this new popular spirit, than from any probable exercise of the prerogative; and the cause of the monarchy, connected as it was at that juncture with greatly moderated pretensions on the part of the king, was found powerful enough to rally around it a large portion of the commons, and, ere long, the majority of the lords.

Of Buckingham, who exercised so great a sway during the first of these periods, little need be said. His graceful person first recommended him to the late king; and his accomplishments as a courtier, which confirmed him in his ascendancy over the mind of that weak prince, gave him a similar influence over the better nature of his successor. But even as a courtier—the capacity in which he displayed his only ability—he was deficient in the first requisite of his vocation—command of temper, and in consequence was always surrounding himself with needless opposition and difficulty. That the fabric of his fortune was not demolished from this cause, almost as suddenly as it was reared, was owing

mainly to the pusillanimity of James, and to that peculiarity of temperament in his successor, which so often disqualified him for acting from his own resources, and which, especially, led his young mind while exposed to much vexation by the conduct of parliament and of his queen, to make a sort of refuge of his favourite. Buckingham conformed himself to the comparative decency of the new court, after having pandered to the worst vices of the old. But so little effort did he make to conceal his generally vicious inclinations, that actions which might have borne the appearance of virtue in other men, were sure not to be so regarded in his instance. Charles appears to have been the only man of discernment in the kingdom who failed to see in this minion, the headstrong upstart, whose pride of commanding all the subjects of the realm, had taught him to set both prudence and intrigue at nought; whose profuse liberality and furious resentments, were only different modes of indulging the same towering passions; and who could never meddle with any affair of war or policy without betraying a total want both of capacity and principle. It is to the circumstance that this man, personally so destitute of every thing that could make him an object of confidence or fear, was the functionary at whose disposal all the moneys voted by parliament would have been placed, and to whose management every enterprise sanctioned by that assembly would have been entrusted, that we must look for the main cause of the reluctance evinced by the commons to meet the demands which were made upon them in the early part of this reign.

Charles ascended the throne in the spring of 1625, and Buckingham was assassinated in August, 1628. During that interval, the duke made, and unmade, and made again, at pleasure. But at his decease, the power which had thus centered in himself, fell in a greater degree into the hands of his dependents, and was further distributed, after a while, among certain new men who were called to the direction of public affairs. Among the persons into whose hands the reins of government then passed, the first place should perhaps be given to Sir Richard Weston—not that his ability or his worth exceeded those of the rest, but on account of the superiority to which he aspired, and which he in some degree obtained.

Weston was a person of good family, and from his youth made court preferment the object of his ambition. In his education, his travels, and his subsequent attendance at court in the hope of employment, he spent the greater part of his patrimony, and to avoid consuming the whole was obliged at length to throw himself on the generosity of his friends, and upon the assistance of persons who regarded the probabilities of his fortune as sufficiently promising to lend money upon them. Men who look with such a temper toward advancement in the slippery places of a court, are

not likely to prove very scrupulous about the moral complexion of the work assigned to them. Weston's first employment was an embassy on the affair of the Palatinate. On his return, he was raised to the office of Chancellor of the Exchequer; and afterwards, through the influence of Buckingham, he became Lord Treasurer. When the tide set in against the favourite, Weston sympathized more strongly with the resentment of his patron than the great caution of his previous history had led men to expect. He had now pursued his long chosen course of studying to please every body from whom the slightest service might possibly be obtained, with a good degree of success, and he appears to have resolved from this time on seeking his aggrandisement at court, at the hazard of being denounced as the great enemy of the constitution, and of the public weal, elsewhere. The royal treasury, accordingly, was freely replenished from the most illegal sources. But Weston was less fortunate in managing the pecuniary affairs of his own household; and, at the same time, became so much the victim of an appetite for wealth and power, that a restless craving with regard to something in the distance, always rendered him incapable of enjoying the acquisitions he had made, his ostentation, and want of economy in his private affairs, and his much greater facility in surrounding himself with difficulties than in extricating himself from them, tending continually to multiply the sources of his inquietude. In his impeachment, commenced in the parliament of 1628, he was described as the man who had set himself to act on the policy of Buckingham—and as not less an enemy to the religion and liberties of the kingdom; nor would he have retained office or footing in England during the few years of life which awaited him, had he not been protected against the proceedings instituted against him by the suspension of parliaments which followed. Most of his family were Catholics, and he was himself charged with being of that creed; but the popish recusant pointed in proof of the contrary to the fact, that the treasury had never been so enriched by fines exacted from the professors of that faith as during the administration of Weston. This patriotic statesman was created Earl of Portland, in 1632, and died two years later.

In Sir Thomas Coventry, the Lord Keeper, we find a much better man. He was the son of a lawyer, and a person of unusual parts and industry. Before his fortieth year he had filled the office of recorder of London, and became solicitor and Attorney-General. The great seal was committed to him in 1626, and was retained to the time of his death, in 1642. Clarendon states, that no man had ever brought to this last office a greater fitness for its duties. At the council table, he was qualified beyond any other person to offer advice on matters relating to foreign policy, or to the civil and ecclesiastical constitution of the realm. But

the manner in which affairs were conducted by his colleagues, was so little accordant with his views, that he despaired at length of doing any good by meddling with public questions, and could rarely be induced to speak on any subject not connected immediately with the administration of justice as pertaining to his office. He was a person of grave aspect and manners, but was distinguished by a simple and natural urbanity which gave him the reputation of being an accomplished courtier. His speaking, which never rose to brilliancy of any kind, was always effective from the force of his views, and the confidence placed in the honesty of his intentions. But the moderate course which his comprehensive understanding, and his general integrity disposed him to pursue, if it left him without violent enemies, failed to surround him with powerful friends. Coventry never obtained much credit with the king, and we may judge of the materials of which the court of Charles the First was composed, from the fact that, according to Clarendon, the lord keeper could not look to a single person in it as possessing the power and inclination 'to prevent or divert any disadvantage' to which he might be exposed. His policy, accordingly, was to stand on the defensive, and his part in that respect was so well performed, that he maintained his position, notwithstanding the vigorous efforts made to dislodge him by such men as Weston, and by the Marquis of Hamilton, the kinsman of the sovereign. We must not suppose that he retained his place during a period when law was so often violated by the government, without becoming liable to censure in the esteem of truly patriotic men. But it is something to know, that his inconvenient objections in point of law, often proved a formidable impediment in the path of those arbitrary measures to which the king and his ministers were so much inclined. On such occasions a collision generally occurred between the lord keeper, and Manchester, Lord Privy Seal.

The Earl of Manchester was a much older man than Sir Thomas Coventry, and of longer standing in the practice of his profession, but a person who had found it less difficult to gratify his love of business than his love of money. Buckingham, in consideration of a large bribe—not less than £20,000—had raised this man to the office of Lord Treasurer, but on some pretext, deprived him after a little time of his staff; and, again, as a sort of recompence for the exemplary patience with which he had submitted to this treatment, conferred on him the titles of Viscount Mandeville, and Earl of Manchester, and raised him from the office of President of the Council to that of Lord Privy Seal. When appealed to in council in opposition to Coventry, Manchester generally discovered sufficient willingness to place all the weight at his disposal in the scale of the court policy. Among the people he had the reputation of being a sound Protestant, a cir-

cumstance which, together with the gravity and caution of his manners, procured him some credit at a distance. But among those who knew him best, his venality deprived his opinions of the respect to which they would otherwise have been entitled. Manchester held the office of Privy Seal to his death, which happened on the eve of the civil war.

The Earl of Arundel took precedence in council of all who were not there as officers of state. The character of this nobleman, as given by Clarendon, embraces as great a number of bad points as could well meet in the same person. He was a professed lover of antiquity, and a collector of all things deemed valuable by the virtuoso. He affected, not only the costume and the manners, but the high feudal notions of remote times. In the country, his unsocial temper made him at all times unpopular; and at court, his pride bowed to no superiority beneath the throne, and with difficulty acknowledged it even there. Hence his complaints sometimes extended to the conduct of the king himself, and he often seemed to live for the purpose of making himself enemies, to whom he gave no small advantage by deeming their hostility a matter too mean for his thoughts. He must, however, have been regarded as a man of some ability, or he would not have been so frequently employed in diplomatic services, and still less would he have been placed at the head of the army raised to suppress the rebellion in Scotland. But in prospect of the civil war, Arundel embarked for Italy, where he ended his days—a country much more in harmony with his tastes and character than England.

Next to Arundel, stood the Earl of Pembroke—his opposite in nearly all respects. Pembroke was a nobleman of ample fortune, and generous temperament, and of good average ability. Few men in such connexions have avoided crossing the path of others, and made themselves generally popular, with so little apparent difficulty. With the credit of good capacity, he possessed the higher reputation of being governed by unbiassed purposes; and, in consequence, often attracted to himself the confidence both of the court and the country parties in the disputes which arose between them. Clarendon describes him as ‘a great lover of the religion of his country;’ but has made disclosures which justify the suspicion that his lordship’s ruling passion was a love of women. Soon after Charles came to the throne, Pembroke had his disagreements with Buckingham, and would, probably, have done much more towards curbing the insufferable arrogance of the favourite, had not the dagger of Felton interposed. Pembroke did not survive Buckingham more than two years.

The Earl of Pembroke of whom we read so frequently in the history of the civil war, was brother to the nobleman last mentioned. He had been a sort of favourite with James the First,

soon after his accession, who created him Earl of Montgomery. He managed to insinuate himself further into the favour of the king in a few hours, than had been possible in the case of any other attendant since the departure of his majesty from Scotland. But more powerful claimants to the place of royal favourite were soon to make their appearance, and Montgomery contrived to retain the second place in the affections of the monarch by not attempting to dispute the first. This was the more practicable, as in his intercourse with the king, he had never affected much of the statesman, aspiring to little more than agreeable companionship, particularly in the sports of the field. James, on his death-bed, had commended Montgomery to the favour of Charles, as a person of tried fidelity, and he was appointed about that time to the office of Lord Chamberlain. On becoming Earl of Pembroke, in 1630, he obtained a place in the council, and had more to do with public affairs, but not in such a shape as to attract observation until the commencement of the troubles in Scotland. He then expressed himself strongly against any attempt to settle the questions at issue by the sword. Such expressions were sure to displease the king, and those in whom he most confided. While affairs were in this posture, a dispute arose in a committee of the House of Lords between Pembroke and Lord Mowbray, the eldest son of the Earl of Arundel, which came to blows, and both were sent to the Tower. It was expected that the disputants would be allowed after a few days to resume their seats, and the affair be forgotten. But Charles, to the surprise of every one, called upon Pembroke, on the pretext of this indiscretion, to resign his staff as Chamberlain, after holding it nearly sixteen years. It is probable, that this proceeding had its influence on the mind of Pembroke with regard to the questions at issue between the king and the parliament. But, on the other hand, the part which the earl was supposed to have taken in the proceedings of the stannery courts, and with respect to various acts of council, and decrees of the star-chamber, was so far censured in what had been done by the parliament, as to afford him sufficient ground for umbrage in that quarter. Clarendon, indeed, affirms that his determination to take part with the two houses, rather than with the king, was the effect of his fears, and of a wish to propitiate them as the stronger power. But it is certain, that for some time previous to the disgrace put upon him by the king, Pembroke had been accustomed to censure many things in the conduct of the government, and in the most public manner. It had always been his boast, that though resident at court, he would never be its slave; and admitting that he was a man of as much talk as courage, it is probable that when he so spoke he spoke the truth. It should be remembered, too, that supposing him to have taken the side of the parliament from fear, the scale seemed to turn ere long, and more

than once, in the opposite direction. But during the oscillations of party Pembroke betrayed no disposition to change. In fact, the lessons which he is known to have received from Lord Say, operating on his previous inclination toward the popular cause, were, no doubt, the main inducement to his better choice. The battle of Edgehill was claimed by the royalists as a victory, and it certainly had the effect of bringing the waverers in great numbers to their standard, spreading alarm to the very gates of the capital. Pembroke was one of a deputation sent by the Two Houses at that juncture, to call upon the citizens of London to arm themselves for their common defence, and his lordship assured his auditors that he had 'ever so good a heart to the business that 'he should live and die in it.' Subsequently, indeed, during the progress—or rather the no-progress of the treaty of Uxbridge, when the self-denying ordinance became the subject of discussion, Pembroke is said to have expressed to Clarendon, one of the royalist commissioners, his deep sorrow that his conduct should have tended, in any degree, to bring affairs to such an issue, and to have urged that the demands of the parliament should be immediately complied with, however insincerely, as the only means of preventing the adoption of the proscribed ordinance, the immediate effect of which would be to place the army at the disposal of men who were prepared to abolish both the monarchy and the peerage, and to set up a republic. It is not improbable that his lordship did express himself to that effect, and his having done so gives us a much more favourable notion of his discernment than Clarendon is willing should be entertained. It is, however, no doubt true, that he was a man of more passion than judgment, and wanting in that dignity and decision of conduct which his station demanded; but he appears to have chosen his party sincerely, and to have been willing to suffer in its cause, though he would probably have deplored the fate that should have obliged him to become conspicuous in any cause, at the hazard of his high rank, and large wealth. So long as there was a House of Lords, Pembroke continued to fill his place there.

With Arundel and Pembroke, as leading men in the council, mention should be made of the earls of Dorset, Carlisle, and Holland. The Earl of Dorset was a nobleman eminently endowed both in mind and person, but destitute of the moral firmness necessary to protect him against the stream of corruption which had set in upon every thing within the verge of the court during the past reign. His life, accordingly, was much more that of the man of pleasure than of the statesman, disgraced to the end by excess and consequent embarrassment, and exhibiting the wreck of capacities that might have been employed with effect in the public service.

The Earl of Carlisle was a native of Scotland, and a person

always acceptable to the late king. His attainments as a scholar were considerable ; his understanding unusually comprehensive, and his accomplishments as a courtier were supposed to be equal or superior to those of any man of his own age, whether in England or elsewhere. His property, by his marriage, and by grants from the crown—the latter amounting in all to not less than £400,000—was sufficient to have placed him among the richest men in the kingdom. But his passion for expense in dress, equipage, and feasting, was such as had never been witnessed in England, and not only served to make a rich man poor, but to corrupt the times in which he lived. He had persuaded himself that the delinquencies attendant on the path of the man of pleasure, are not greater than have been found inseparable from that of the statesman, and that the rivalries constantly besetting a man in the latter course, rarely need trouble him in the former. Hence, the fine capacity he is said to have possessed, instead of being employed in the service of the country from whose resources he derived so much, served no higher purpose than to cater for the small matters of personal ease and indulgence. What shall we say of such an ingrate soil—ever receiving the dew and the rain from heaven, but returning nothing again ? What is, perhaps, still more enigmatical, the man whose life exhibited so base a prostitution of the gifts of nature, lay upon his death-pillow for several days, looking forward to his dissolution with as little disturbance as a saint in his cloister. This was shortly before the outbreak of the civil war. His principal employment had been in negotiating the marriage between Charles and Henrietta.

The Earl of Holland bore too near a resemblance to the Earl of Carlisle, with whom he always lived on terms of the strictest intimacy. He was younger brother to the Earl of Warwick, and senior brother to the Earl of Newport. Having spent some time in Paris, and performed his novitiate as a soldier, after the fashion of the age, in the service of Holland, he made his appearance at the English court. His handsome presence, and his mild and polished address, soon gave him a place in the favour of the king, which he was sufficiently skilful to retain, without exciting the jealousy of Buckingham. As the fruit of the good understanding which he studied to perpetuate between himself and the favourite, he was made Captain of the Guard, and Knight of the Garter, and obtained a place in the Privy Council as Earl of Holland. He was placed by the same influence near the prince, and employed as an ambassador in the affair of his marriage. On the decease of Buckingham, the queen endeavoured, and not without a disastrous measure of success, to supply his place in regulating the exercises of the royal favour, and the Earl of Holland, having always possessed the good opinion of Henrietta,

hoped from that time to exert a greater influence, through her medium, in court matters, than any other person. Nor can he be said to have failed in this policy.

But the dubious splendour of his career faded rapidly from the time of the Scottish invasion. At that juncture he was made general of the horse, mainly through the influence of the queen. But he gained no credit in that capacity. When the division of the country into its two great parties took place, Holland, from the mere pique of the courtier, more than from any regard to public principle, took side with the parliament. This conduct brought upon him the heaviest censures from the party he had deserted, particularly from Charles and the queen. His own conscience also,—for we will hope that some element of that nature was still left—appears to have upbraided him, and together with his not being made so important a person among his new friends, as his vanity had led him to expect, disposed him to entertain the thought of regaining his place in the court. With this view he made his appearance in Oxford, but met with so doubtful a reception, that he returned again to the quarters of the parliament, where he soon found himself placed under arrest. His next action was an attempt to produce a rising of the royalists in the metropolis and its neighbourhood, at the time of Hamilton's invasion. He failed in that enterprize, was taken prisoner at St. Neot's, and soon afterwards beheaded, in pursuance of a sentence pronounced in the high court of justice and confirmed by parliament. His public conduct in the latter years of his life, may be traced in part to the weakness of his judgment, but much more to his want of fixed principle of any kind. He was one of those rudderless barks, which are sure not to escape damage amid the cross currents of troubled times. Burke, in his *Reflections on the French Revolution*, points to the fate of this nobleman as a striking instance of the retribution generally awaiting men who injure the throne by their own bad conduct, and then desert it in its time of need. But this doctrine of providential retribution is not quite so clear as the fancy of Burke would suggest. Is a deficiency in loyalty the only moral want that we may expect providence to take under its special cognizance?

With the members of council we have mentioned, Buckingham associated Sir John Cooke and Sir Dudley Carleton, as Secretaries of State,—the former a narrow-minded plodding accountant, the latter a shallow diplomatist, who had spent so much time in foreign countries as to have formed the most mistaken conceptions with regard to the constitution and temper of his own. A person equally under the direction of the duke, and much more effectively employed by him, was Bishop Laud, of whom, however, so much has been said by all writers who have

treated of his times, that no man can hope to offer any thing new concerning him. Attempts are still made by our high churchmen to hold up this personage as something very like a perfect model of ecclesiastical wisdom and virtue. If we must indeed account him a wise man, it is rather unfortunate that his wisdom should have been of so strange a complexion as to have led him to do much more than any other man of his age toward destroying what he meant to preserve, and setting up what he meant to put down. Certainly it is not difficult to find men who thus look one way and pull another, but we have not been wont to place them among the wise of their generation. In fact, the genius of this 'little great man,' as Bishop Williams very properly called him, was of that order which never ascends from small details to great principles. If the object of pursuit selected by such a man be neither wise nor good, he will not find it difficult to persuade himself that it has both these recommendations; and then, by a further process of self-deception, and in the true spirit of the fanatic, will perhaps reconcile himself to almost any thing in the order of means, for the sake of such an end. Thus Laud, who always held the canons of the church, even in its most corrupt age, in great honour, became a party in adjudging certain spiritual offenders to lose their ears, and to be branded in the face, notwithstanding the said canons had provided that no clergyman should be a party to any sentence depriving an accused person of life or member. When the sufferers reminded their priestly judge of his inconsistency in this particular, he denied the charge, affirming that, as the loss of the ear was not the loss of hearing, it was no loss of a limb! On the same occasion, you might hear him whining out his expressions of pity over the obstinate depravity which made such punishment unavoidable, and the next moment you might see him cap in hand, bowing to the functionaries about him, and giving them his best thanks as having come to a judgment in this case so expressive of their enlightened sense of duty toward the throne and their religion!

So evil, however, were the times, that soon after the death of Buckingham, this man, who was more fit for Bedlam than for the management of any great interest, was raised to the primacy of the English church, and suffered to diffuse the spirit of his own fretful and merciless intolerance from one end of the kingdom to the other. The great drift of his policy was, to make more of the garniture of religion than of the thing itself, and to put down all classes of persons who were not prepared to do likewise. His demand was for the tithe, the anise, and the cummin; and if he had his reasons for saying a little, he had also reasons for saying only a little, about the weightier matters—judgment, mercy, and faith.

Not content with the power which he possessed as Archbishop,

Laud, to the great umbrage of many of the nobility, procured the appointment of Juxon, Bishop of London, to the place of Lord Treasurer, the highest secular office in the state. Juxon was a man of exemplary character, but of small ability in the duties of his proper calling, and of none at all in any thing else; nor was he ambitious of such a trust. But the primate had his ends to accomplish, by placing such a person in the near intercourse with the king inseparable from that office. For the same reasons he would probably have been rash enough to have recommended another churchman to the office of Chancellor of the Exchequer, had such an arrangement been possible. But that place was assigned soon after the death of Buckingham to Sir Francis Cottington.

Cottington was an old diplomatist and courtier—a man possessing a marvellous command of temper; fond of money, so as not to be very scrupulous about the manner of getting it; an expert hypocrite, whenever there was any thing to be gained by putting on the mask; and always prepared to supply the royal wants by means of illegal exactions to any extent consistent with safety. His tyranny in the court of Wards, which was also committed to his management, made him exceedingly unpopular with a large portion of the nobility and gentry through the kingdom. After the meeting of the Long Parliament, Cottington resigned his offices, as the means of propitiating his enemies. Subsequently, he was active among the exiled royalists who attended the court of Charles II. He began his public life during the last reign as an agent of the English court at Madrid, where he resided twelve years, and in the end indulged both his political and religious bias by choosing to close his days in Spain, where he died a professed Catholic, in 1651, having accumulated a large fortune while holding his various offices.

During some years previous to the meeting of the Long Parliament, there was a lesser cabinet, among whom nearly all state matters were digested, before being submitted to the meetings of the council; and in that circle, Laud and Cottington, little fitted as they seemed to be for acting together, divided the government in a great measure between them. Strafford was prevented taking the lead in that connexion which would otherwise have fallen to him, by his duties in Ireland. The Earl of Northumberland was invited to such conferences on the ground of his rank, more than on account of any disposition evinced by him to become active in public affairs: the Marquis of Hamilton possessed great influence with the king, but exercised his subtle and selfish policy more with regard to particular projects, than to the general machinery of the government; and Vane and Windebanke, who completed this fraternity, were present as Secretaries of State, their assistance being necessary to the shaping, and par-

ticularly to the execution, of the measures agreed upon. Vane was one of that numerous class of worthies who become the willing servants of a court, purely in consequence of having learnt to look upon it as the quarter in which they can best serve themselves. Windebanke was governed by the same species of virtue, but prosecuted his objects with a bolder temper than his colleagues, particularly as it respected dispensing with the penal laws against Catholics. When the Long Parliament began its work of retribution, Vane was deprived of his office. Windebanke would have suffered more considerably, had he not avoided the resentment of the House of Commons by making his escape to France.

In so doing, Windebanke followed the example of Sir John Finch, the lord keeper of the great seal. This last person was the man who, as speaker of the Commons in 1628, refused to put to the vote the protest moved by Sir John Eliot, though supported by a great majority of the house. His conduct on that occasion, was the effect of a secret understanding between him and the king, and was a crime never to be forgiven by the patriots. But the court was not unmindful of its instrument, and Finch proclaimed his sense of the favour which it shed upon him, by the boldness and activity with which he supported its most extravagant pretensions. On the question of ship-money he canvassed the judges, and extorted the votes of ten in its favour:—Crook and Hutton being the only men who had virtue enough to avow themselves dissentients, and even they did so but in part. Finch, indeed, had the audacity to say in open court, that he hoped to see the day when no man would be found saucy enough to question the authority of an order in council, any more than of an Act of Parliament. In short, this man began his career with little law and less principle; and from 1628 gave himself up to prosecute the objects of an arbitrary government at all hazards. His head would probably have been the price of his temerity, had he not fled from the laws he violated, and the country which he betrayed.

Such then was the character of the persons who were confided in by the king when he dismissed his third parliament, and addressed himself to the perilous enterprize of governing the people of England without the intervention of such assemblies. If we except Laud, there is not one of these men, so far as our memory serves us, of whom Clarendon himself has not spoken in terms of disparagement or censure, as strong, or even stronger, than we have ventured to employ. In the men of business, including Sir Richard Weston, Sir Francis Cottington, Bishop Laud, the Earl of Manchester, Sir John Finch, and their subordinates, Cooke, Carleton, and Windebanke, we see parties with whom the will of the king was in fact every thing, and the community nothing,

except so far as its resources might be made to subserve the royal pleasure. From the pampered sensuality of Carlisle, and the profligate selfishness of the Earl of Holland, no man could expect anything better than ensued. The Marquis of Hamilton was always ready to abet the most illegal proceedings, when of a kind to promise him some personal advantage, and such as might be pursued without any very manifest or immediate danger; and in this temper he would not have lacked countenance from Arundel, had the habits of that haughty personage allowed of his frequent attendance at the meetings of the council. Northumberland, also, was too often absent on such occasions to operate as any check on irregularity; and Pembroke, if we may credit Clarendon, was wanting too generally in the disposition to do so; while Juxon, feeble in every thing, was never allowed to forget that his staff as Lord Treasurer had been entrusted to him purely from the reliance which Laud placed on his subserviency. In the presence of such colleagues, it is hardly surprising that the moderate homage to the sovereignty of the law sometimes expressed by Coventry, should have been checked as a note of discord. Certain it is, that the reception given to a tone of patriotism so very discreet, was such as disposed him to hold his peace, as the only means of retaining his office.

But into such hands principally, did this noble country fall, during the twelve years which preceded the year 1640. Charles appears to have looked with some misgiving on this doubtful array of supporters, when contemplating, as he did at the commencement of that period, the abeyance of the constitution. It was at that juncture that the monarch endeavoured to detach some of the patriots from their course by the offer of court favour, and this new policy,—new because in our history the government had generally been so strong as not to need its aid,—was not put into requisition in vain. These overtures were accepted by Sir Dudley Digges, a member of the Commons, whose advocacy of popular rights had subjected him to imprisonment, and who subsequently became Master of the Rolls; and by Lord Saville, who had been for some time distinguished as the great opponent of the Wentworth family in Yorkshire. But, concerning the former of these persons, little subsequent mention is made; and the latter became remarkable, as a man more and more avoided and disowned, by every thing honourable and decent in the party to which he would have given his services. The bait, however, which allured such men, was placed with no less success before others whose services promised to be of high value. Noy, the most erudite lawyer on the popular side, after Sir Edward Coke, was thus seduced; Littleton followed his example, and accepted the office of Solicitor-General, Noy being made Attorney-General. In the wake of these persons followed Sir Thomas

Wentworth, whose talents and eloquence seemed to point him out as the future leader of the great party which he appeared to have chosen.

Noy, while he brought his legal ability to the cause of the people, was not a popular man in his temper or manners. His diligence in the service of his new friends, led to the discovery, among the records in the Tower, of certain ancient documents, which were made available as a precedent in support of the memorable impost known by the name of ship-money. His recommendation indeed, founded on the authority of these obsolete writs, proceeded no farther than to advise that the ports should each be required to furnish a certain number of vessels, for the protection of the trade and the coasts of the island. He did not venture to urge that they should be required to pay a pecuniary tax for that object, still less that the impost should be laid on all the counties of the kingdom, and that, at such times, and to such an extent as the sovereign should determine; nor did he live to see his precedent made subject, in this manner, to a latitude of application, which rendered the maxim, that Englishmen are not to be taxed without their consent, an utter mockery.

Of Sir Thomas Wentworth, as of Laud, we need say little, inasmuch as nearly every thing that can be said about him has been said so often. Brodie has shown that Wentworth's avowal of popular principles was not so early as we had been accustomed to suppose; and Guizot, we believe, was the first writer to point out the particulars which show that the loud patriotic professions in which it was the pleasure of Wentworth to indulge during the discussions of 1628, had been preceded by a cautious neutrality, connected with such indications as leave us no room to doubt that his declarations as one of the patriotic party at that juncture, were the effect, not of any real sympathy with popular freedom, but of circumstances which seemed just then to have shut the court against him. That he meditated nothing less, when in the height of his power, than the destruction of the constitution, and the setting up of an arbitrary monarchy in its room, after the manner of the most despotic states on the continent, is now unquestionable. We indeed possess evidence to this effect, much more decisive than was available in that age. Enough, however, appeared, even then, to make almost any penalty short of death a punishment greatly below the enormity of his offences.

But the patriot men who retained the beginning of their confidence—where are they? Some, before 1640, had finished their course. Others, having made their stand in successive parliaments against a government by court favouritism and arbitrary power, employed the interval during which there were no parliaments in a closer study of the questions at issue between them and their opponents, and in silent efforts to diffuse their sentiments, and to

cherish the hope that the visible triumph of a herd of parasites over the rights of the people, would not be of long continuance—though in this latter respect they sometimes appeared to themselves as men hoping against hope. Among the men who had acquitted themselves with great honour in the cause of freedom a little previous to the death of Buckingham, and of whom little or no mention is made at a later period, we may name Sir Edwyn Sandys, Sir Robert Philips, Sir Francis Seymour, Sir Walter Earle, Sir Peter Hayman, Sir Miles Hobart, Sir Henry Martin, Sir Nathaniel Rich, Sir Edward Coke, Sir John Eliot; and Messrs. Alford, Malory, Coriton, Long, Stroud, Valentine, Glanville, Kirton, Sherland, and Rouse. Most of these persons suffered imprisonment, exile, or other inconveniences, at the pleasure of the crown, as the punishment for their alleged misconduct, as members of the House of Commons. Great thanks were due in particular to the learned labours of Sir Edward Coke; and much admiration and gratitude to the unflinching heroism of Sir John Eliot, a man who, notwithstanding the sneer of Hume, taken up so readily by Mr. D'Israeli, is entitled to the full homage of 'a martyr to English liberty.'

Of Sir Edward Coke it is unnecessary that we should now speak, having recently treated so largely of his character and services. Though by no means a faultless man, we are free to say of him that, as the patriarch of his vocation, he laid the fruits of his advanced age upon the altar of his country, and did so with the warmth and energy of a youthful devotion.

At the close of the third parliament in this reign, Eliot was committed to the Tower, and as the 'greatest offender and ring-leader' in the proceedings of the House of Commons for some time past, was sentenced to be imprisoned at the king's pleasure, and to pay a fine of £2000. Sir John Eliot was a native of Cornwall. Having completed his education at Oxford, and at one of the inns of Court, he spent some time on the continent, when he chanced to make the acquaintance of George Villiers, afterwards Duke of Buckingham; and this acquaintance did not wholly cease when Villiers became the court favourite. It did not lead, however, to anything on the part of Eliot, so far as we can see, tending to justify the slightest suspicion of the sincerity of his political professions at a later period. His private character was not without its imperfections, his passions being generally so ardent that, according to his own admission, he sometimes found it exceedingly difficult to control them. In a dispute on one occasion with a neighbour, he drew his weapon, and inflicted a wound on the person of his opponent. Mr. D'Israeli has been disposed to give the darkest colouring to this act, but cannot prevent the dispassionate reader from perceiving that this outbreak of youthful passion was provoked by taunting words, that it was

soon deplored, and followed by so sincere a reconciliation between him and Moyle, the injured party, as could never have taken place, had the proceeding been accompanied by those base circumstances which Echard's malignant partizanship disposed him to connect with it. The daughter of Moyle states, that, subsequent to the occurrence adverted to, the private character of Sir John Eliot was as free from fault as his public conduct. Echard describes him as going to London to beg the interference of the Duke of Buckingham on the affair between him and the Moyles, and talks of the conduct of the duke on that occasion as the cause of Eliot's subsequent feeling of hostility, while, in fact, at that time, Villiers had to commence the trial of his fortune as a courtier. Mr. D'Israeli, to whom any appearance of infirmity in the career of a patriot, is one of the most precious things in the whole circle of possible discovery, has given full credence to this mendacious story.

Eliot had distinguished himself in the popular cause before Charles ascended the throne, and after that event no trace of intimacy between him and Buckingham is observable. He was not formed for subserviency to the minion of a court, and a little of that proud neglect which is so natural to the manners of favourites, would suffice to prevent his placing any reliance on such friendships. It is plain that when the king assembled his first parliament, Eliot had so far imbibed the general feeling against Buckingham, as to have become one of the most active and formidable of the party who made the overthrow of that minister the great object of their policy. No man did so much to expose the weakness and misconduct of the government, and to make the granting of supplies depend on the redress of grievances. When it became known that Charles meditated a sudden dissolution of the third parliament, Eliot, in an elaborate and impassioned address, called upon the Commons to place the barrier of their most solemn protest in the way of any proceedings on the part of the government inconsistent with the power and privileges of parliament. Charles, expecting something of this sort, had instructed the speaker, Sir John Finch, to vacate the chair, should any such matter be introduced; and the speaker, as all our histories relate, refusing to put the prepared protest, was detained by force in the chair, until the expressions of that paper had received the formal sanction of the House. This act, together with the severity of his temper and proceedings against Buckingham, exposed Eliot in a peculiar degree to the resentment of the king; and when it became known that Charles intended attempting to carry on the government without the aid of parliaments, it was obvious that a person so committed against the court, had everything to apprehend from the possible success of such an experiment. Eliot, it appears, had provided against all reverses of this sort, by settling his property

on his sons, so that the sum imposed on him as a fine, though eagerly sought after, could not be obtained. In the 'dark and smoky room' allotted him in the Tower, he gave his time to reading, reflection, and composition, and to correspondence with his children and his friends, particularly with the patriot Hampden, then little known beyond the walks of private life, to whose wise oversight he committed the education of his children. Some of the letters which passed between these remarkable persons have happily reached our time, and show them to have been men of extraordinary parts, of various knowledge, of refined imagination and feeling, and governed by a highly enlightened piety, and the purest sympathy with every thing morally beautiful. But the health of the mind is no security for that of the body, and while Charles found it possible for a time to taste the sweets of power, and to surround himself with the pastimes of a court, his victim was gradually sinking under the progress of consumption. Once and again the king was assured, that nothing but greater liberty and a better air could save the life of his victim. But he was so assured in vain; and even when death had come upon the sufferer, the prayer of his children that they might be allowed to place his ashes in the tomb of his progenitors, was not to be complied with. 'Let Sir John Eliot's body be buried in the church of that parish where he died,' was the royal answer. During the last two months of his life, the restraints laid upon him were even greater than before, and in the month of November, we find him expressing his gratitude for the use of candle, but complaining of being left almost without fire! Mr. D'Israeli cannot conceal his regret at this inhumanity, but avoids censuring the king by indulging in a very convenient exercise of the imagination in his favour. 'The harshness of Charles the First towards Eliot,' says this writer, 'indicates a cause of offence, either of a deeper die, or of a more personal nature, than probably we have yet discovered!'

The long parliament met on the third of November, 1640, and Strafford was executed in the following May. To that interval, belongs the impeachment of Laud and others; the extinction of the courts of star-chamber and high-commission; and the removal of a multitude of alleged grievances in the practice of the civil and ecclesiastical government. These measures were prosecuted by the popular leaders with little or no opposition, and with the general concurrence of the Lords. What should be done with the bishops, was the first question that called forth a marked difference of opinion. All agreed in loudly condemning the late conduct of the ruling clergy, and in urging that their power in future should be materially limited. But two parties soon became distinguishable—the one calling for the entire abolition of episcopacy; the other maintaining that the functions of the order should be much abridged, but that the order itself should be religiously

preserved. This difference prepared the way for another, which led also to important consequences—we refer to the division of opinion respecting the penalty due to the high crimes of the Earl of Strafford. There was much in the temper and proceedings of the leaders in the Commons in relation to the trial of that grand delinquent, and in the spirit of change every where working through the country, which tended to excite suspicion and alarm with many well-meaning persons in both Houses. So great was the impression thus produced, that, strengthened by a few subsequent occurrences, it sufficed to shape that ultimate division of parties which placed the king in a condition to hazard a civil war, and to render the issue of it so long doubtful. It was maintained by those who fell off from the popular party at that juncture, that the king had now gone far enough in the way of concession, and that the excess of power from which danger to the general liberties of the country might be apprehended, had gone over from the monarchial to the popular side. On the other hand it was insisted that the concessions of the king had been made with so much visible reluctance and insincerity, as to leave no room for confidence in the constitutional professions now made by him, and to render it indispensable that the men who from a regard to the public interests had exposed themselves to his displeasure, should provide against the probable resentment of himself and his future advisers, by such a division of the powers of the state as might be adequate both for that purpose, and as a provision against any recurrence of the alarming evils which had been so long attendant on the course of his government. The great question, accordingly, between these parties, related to the new adjustment that should, or should not, be deemed wise and satisfactory towards the monarchy on the one side, and the people on the other.

Among those who had opposed themselves to the exorbitant power of the crown and the hierarchy, and who at this time, or soon afterwards, began to look on the real or supposed designs of the patriots with so much jealousy as to change sides, mention should first be made of Hyde, afterwards Lord Clarendon, in whose train followed Lord Falkland, the Earl of Southampton, the Earl of Hertford, the Earl of Bristol, Lord Digby, Sir John Colepeper, Lord Paget, Lord Lovelace, Sir Hugh Cholmely, and we may add, Colonel Goring, not to mention others who acted only a subordinate part in the subsequent posture of affairs. Several indeed of the persons we have named proved to be feeble men.

Paget appears to have been one of the most active among the peers in supporting the prosecution of Strafford, and similar measures, but as the war approached, was among the first to join the royal standard. He raised a regiment of infantry at his own cost, and further to propitiate the court, made disclosures of every

thing he knew concerning the intentions and plans of the men with whom he had acted, imputing designs to his former colleagues which their enemies are said to have treated as too bad to be worthy of credit. Lovelace concealed his altered preference, and endeavoured to serve the royal cause by acting as a spy on the proceedings of the parliament. Cholmely wore the mask until the arrival of the queen, when he betrayed his trust as governor of the castle of Scarborough. But these circumstances include nearly all we know of the history of these persons.

Goring intrigued much with the leaders of the parliament on the approach of the war, but always for purposes of deception. The old associations of this man, and his rooted profligacy, should have been a sufficient prognostic of his designs. In no man of that time were the bad points in the character of the cavalier more strongly marked. His profanity, debauchery, and licence of all sorts, had scarcely any bounds. These habits—and nothing a jot more reputable, made him a royalist, and made him reckless of principle and decency, whenever the cause of royalty was concerned. When taken in his own snares, or exposed by his excesses or duplicity to the rebuke of his superiors, no man could put on the shy, awkward, contrite delinquent with so much effect. It is not easy to say which was the most remarkable in him—his power of acting the knave, so as to impose on the most prejudiced and incredulous, or the buoyant ingenuity of his temper, which served him in every exigency. He no doubt felt a pleasure in being able to place the town of Portsmouth in the hands of the king, but we may rest assured that to relate over his cups, the manner in which he had outwitted the godly hypocrites who placed him in the trust which he thus betrayed, afforded him an infinitely greater delight. The excesses of his followers in the west—of his ‘lambs’ as this precious innocent was wont to call them—made his name infamous for several generations.

But if there was little in the character of the four persons last mentioned, to add weight to any cause, a different estimate must be formed of the other names which we have classed with them. Hyde, on the meeting of the long parliament, denounced ship money, and many similar abuses, with a vehemence hardly inferior to that of the most sturdy of the patriots. But when the proposed reform of the church was carried so far as to appear to him to threaten its existence; and when the excitement connected with the trial of Strafford betrayed the popular leaders into the use of language, and the adoption of measures, which partook more, in his view, of violence, than of equity or law, he withdrew, first secretly, and afterwards openly, to the side of the court. In what followed, there is evidence enough that his principles and sympathies were nearly all in favour of vesting a greater power in the crown than had been ceded to it by the constitution, and that his

being found among the advocates of popular principles, even for a few short months, is to be attributed solely to the extravagance of the abuses which had become prevalent during the preceding period. No sooner had he found, or imagined, an occasion for falling back from that unnatural position, than he employed himself with much ardour in support of the prerogative. His pen was his only weapon, but with that alone, he did more than any man in England to break the force of the adherence to the cause of the parliament, which, in consequence of the late arbitrary conduct of the king, had manifested itself in every part of the country; and was the person beyond all others whose labours tended to place the royal cause on the footing which enabled Charles to look with confidence of success to the chances of a civil war. The style of his various papers, circulated under the royal sanction everywhere through the kingdom, would be described in our day, in common with that of his history, as massy and cumbrous; but his argument was generally characterized by clearness, continuity, and force, such as his opponents could rarely equal, and which wanted but a better cause to have been irresistible. Few men became parties to the civil war with a more fixed hostility to the popular elements of the constitution; and notwithstanding the pious-seeming talk in which he frequently indulges, and the general propriety and gravity of his deportment, his moral scruples in regard to the means which might be employed to place the power of the Commons in strict subordination to that of the peerage and crown, were not of a very delicate description. He was better acquainted with the histories of Greece and Rome, than with the course of events which had generated and matured the principles of the constitution of his country. His erudition in this respect, rarely passes beyond the age of the Tudors; and his selection of precedents even there, often betrays lamentable ignorance, or gross partiality. It is reported, as a good deed in his history, that he opposed a project at the Restoration, which, if acted upon successfully, would have made Charles II. independent of parliaments. But if the language which he is said to have used on that occasion be correctly reported, his conduct would seem to have resulted from a love of office, more than from any regard to the liberties of the people. His argument with Southampton was, that in such circumstances Charles might govern by the agency of profligates, without the support of men of character, and that they might both calculate on being dismissed as soon as the king should be thus placed in independence of their services.

Falkland was the intimate friend of Clarendon, and if inferior to him in compass of understanding, and power of observation, was his equal in learning, and much his superior in the refinement and impartiality of his moral sentiments. Clarendon himself never appears to more advantage than when paying his sincere tribute

of admiration and affection to the memory of this rarely gifted person, and it is, in fact, to the elaborate efforts of his friendship in this way, that Falkland is chiefly indebted for his fame. The ample fortune placed at his disposal in the twentieth year of his age, was not allowed to divert attention from his studies. Avoiding the court and the capital, he fixed his residence within ten miles of Oxford, and by his tastes and hospitality made his home a favourite resort of the most learned and estimable persons in the University, many of 'those grosser propositions, which laziness 'and consent made current in vulgar conversations,' being examined in the intercourse which took place there, with the freedom proper only to such select conferences. Falkland's first appearance in public was as a member of the parliament assembled in 1627. He was a close observer of what passed in the House of Commons then convened, and became more than ever attached to the institution of parliaments, so that his previous dissatisfaction with the policy of the court was much increased by the abrupt dissolution which followed. But the ideal world which his books and his secluded life had contributed to place around him, was subsequently much shaken and disordered by the violence of the collisions between the parties of the real world in which he now began to act his part. If we give Clarendon credit for the sincerity of his avowed dissatisfaction with the spirit and measures of the long parliament from about the time of the publication of its 'remonstrance,' it is less difficult to make the same concession in favour of Falkland. It is certain that from that time they began to oppose themselves to the policy of the leaders of the Commons; that in so doing, both were laid open to the overtures of the court; and that by both those overtures were, ere long, accepted. But the causes which unsettled the mind of Falkland as a parliamentarian, soon began to operate upon him to the same effect as a royalist. He must, we think, soon have felt, that the maxims and temper of the majority among those to whom he had gone over, were not less at variance with the elements of his own character, than those of the least moderate men in the party which he had forsaken. In fact, his uneasiness, arising in a great measure from this source, is so manifest, that, had his life been spared, it is not easy to say what his ultimate course would have been. He fell in the first battle of Newbury, in the thirty-fourth year of his age.

The secession of the Earl of Southampton from the popular cause was a more serious loss to that interest than the defection of Falkland, whose youth and indecision naturally prevented his making any strong impression on the times. Southampton was held in general and high estimation. He was a nobleman of excellent parts, and ready elocution; governed by moderate views, and by a more enlightened sense of honour, and more humane

feeling than the greater number even in the better class among the party to which he joined himself in 1642. His aim was to bring about a moderate adjustment of the claims of both parties, and not to favour the absolute triumph of either. No man did more to prevent the unsheathing of the sword, and when that event could be no longer deferred, he never failed to echo Falkland's frequent call for peace. Southampton lived to the time of the Restoration, and did good service in checking the profligate confidence of bad men at that perilous juncture.

The Marquis of Hertford was a person of more scholarship than Southampton, but less able in council, less active, and though somewhat prominent in the early part of the war, was too much attached to private life, and not sufficiently aided in his new policy as a royalist by those who were dependent on him, to become very formidable as the antagonist of his old friends. The lethargy of his habits, was the principal objection to his appointment, through the influence of the popular party in 1642, as the superintendent of the education of the Prince of Wales; but in the field he was never accounted deficient in energy or courage.

Few noblemen had been placed in circumstances more unfriendly to a favourable estimate of the character of the king than the Earl of Bristol. His part in the negotiations with regard to the Spanish match, and the treatment which he experienced in connexion with that business, both from Buckingham and from Charles, called into exercise the lofty pride, the high physical and moral courage, and the experience in affairs, by which he was distinguished. Bristol was, moreover, a person of good presence; and his parts, which were considerable, had been improved by education; but as a speaker, he was much too prolix to produce impression, and too readily betrayed into passionate language when opposed.—He acted for a while with the improvement party in the upper House, but more as the effect of the position in which he happened to be placed with regard to the court, than in consequence of any fixed principle or real solicitude about matters of good government. Having uttered some strong expressions in his place in parliament which gave great umbrage to some of the liberal party there, he was committed to the Tower; and though his release took place only two days later, the occurrence, as might have been expected, was enough to decide the withdrawment of his doubtful allegiance from those who had so dealt with him. There was much, however, in his temper, and still more in the nature of the public disagreement which had taken place between him and the king, to make it hardly possible that anything like a feeling of attachment should exist on either side. In the rank of the patriots, he was a person out of place from the want of any real sympathy with the spirit of freedom; and in the councils and operations of the royalists he was always

impotent, from the want of cordial association with the king, and with those most favoured by him.

Lord Digby, the eldest son of the Earl of Bristol, took a more effective part in public affairs than his father, both during the civil war and for some time before. As the second Earl of Bristol, he exhibited articles of impeachment against Clarendon soon after the Restoration, and the account given of him in the History of the Rebellion, which was written subsequently to that proceeding, should always be read with this fact in mind. On the whole, however, Clarendon has given a more just report of his antagonist, than we should have expected from a person so liable to the influence of strong prejudice. It is admitted that he was a person of eminent parts and acquirements, and that the care bestowed on his education had enriched his mind with such various knowledge, that he could offer pertinent observations on nearly all subjects. We learn, however, from other sources, as well as from Clarendon, that the ability of Digby in some respects, was not more remarkable than his infirmity in others. In the House of Commons, his clear, bold, masculine eloquence, generally produced a powerful effect; but the ardour of his passions, and the force of his imagination, which contributed to his efficiency as a speaker, were not sufficiently controlled by the calm and comprehensive views, or by the sound moral feeling, so important to the statesman. His schemes, in consequence, were always verging on the romantic and impracticable, much to the detriment of the king's affairs:—for though Charles was not likely to act upon extravagant suggestions, he was so far disposed to entertain new projects, as to be frequently detained by some *ignis fatuus* of that sort, from pursuing the course, at the proper moment, which circumstances had placed before him. Sir Philip Warwick remarks that this eccentric tendency in the genius of Digby, was so obvious, that sober men often spoke of his cogitations as an apt illustration of the saying of Lord Bacon, who observes, ‘there are ‘some things which have more wonder in them than worth.’ It is clear that ambition was his ruling passion, and that it often took the form of a preposterous vanity, or of a desire to be wondered at—a result which can occasion no surprise when we take into consideration the practical weakness of his judgment, the loose texture of his principles, and his total want of generosity, connected as these defects had always been with great energy of temperament in all other respects, and with a restlessness which nothing could control. His amours, and other irregularities, involved him in expense and embarrassment, which attended him to the end of his days, and often irritated him almost to madness.

The weak points, however, in the character of Digby, were not such as to prevent the king from placing much confidence in his judgment, particularly in the direction of military affairs, and on

the death of Falkland he was raised to the office of secretary of state. After the battle of Naseby, he made a fruitless attempt to join the standard of Montrose, in Scotland—a chief whose passion for the daring and the marvellous was kindred to his own, but more likely to attract admiration at a distance, than to have conducted to harmonious operation, had two such geniuses been called to act together. Subsequently, Digby joined himself to the exiled court; engaged in the wars of the continent; applied himself to the study of astrology; and returned at the Restoration an avowed Catholic. The best apology for his credence in the old science of the stars—next to that afforded by the prevalent notions of his times—is found in the events of his own life, for in the case of few men has destiny appeared to have had more to do, often making his fate apparently desperate at one moment, and extricating him by the most improbable expedients the next. Mr. D'Israeli says, that from his eloquent speech on the trial of Strafford, to his last on the Test Act, 'he poured forth the feelings of a patriot, with the calm sagacity of a statesman,' a flourish of words, which is contradicted by nearly every thing adduced by this same writer concerning this same Lord Digby.

Digby, whose early opposition to the court, like that of his father, sprung more from the circumstance of having quarrelled with it, than from any higher consideration, was among the first to desert the cause of the people, and spared no pains to induce Hyde, Falkland, and Colepeper to follow his example, and to prevail on the king to turn the balance of hesitation on the part of those distinguished persons, by some distinct assurance of his favour. Colepeper, though made master of the Rolls, was a man of more experience in military than in civil affairs. He was a person, however, of some learning, possessing a clear and comprehensive understanding, a most tenacious memory, and distinguished by a facility in stating all that might be conceived as telling for or against a measure. By this schoolman method of viewing questions, he often generated doubt in the mind of others, and greatly impeded the decisions of his own judgment; but when satisfied himself, it was sure to be on such grounds as tended to the same result in the mind of those whom he was desirous to carry along with him. He needed all these better qualities as means of providing against the impression likely to result from the imperfections of his temper, and the roughness of his elocution. He never forgave the late ambitious meddling of the ruling clergy, and it was the habit of Charles to regard a want of zeal in the cause of the bishops, as the same thing with a want of religion.

When it is remembered that of the eighty peers who sat on the trial of Strafford, thirty-five only were consenting to his death, not more than forty-six being present when the House came to its

decision ; and also that more than fifty commoners were denounced by the populace as Straffordians, and betrayers of their country, because they had voted against that course of proceeding, it must be clear that the secession from the constitutional party which soon followed, was in effect much more considerable than the list of names to which we have just now adverted would indicate. These names, however, include the persons whose change attracted most observation, and produced the greatest effect, and our next step will be to glance at the general complexion of the party with which these leading men became now associated.

On the side of the royalists, no man drew his sword more promptly, or wielded it with more determination, than the Earl of Northampton, though until the approach of the war he had rarely given much attention to public affairs. As that crisis came on, he relinquished the ease and license in which men of his rank and fortune so generally passed their time ; and before the king had set up his standard at Nottingham, Northampton appeared at the head of his followers in Warwickshire, to watch the motions of Lord Brook. He raised a troop of horse and a regiment of foot at his own cost, and appointed his four sons as officers under him. All the perils and hardships of a soldier's life he endured with the readiness of one who had grown up among them. His high feudal temper taught him to look with no small contempt on the band of commoners at Westminster, who had dared to talk of placing the power of his order, and of the crown, in subordination to their upstart notions about freedom and its securities. He often spoke of falling in such a contest as the noblest end that could await him, and soon after the commencement of the war he reaped the honour which he professed to covet. At Hopton Heath, his horse was shot from under him in a charge, which separated him from the main body of his followers, and left him at the mercy of his enemies. When called upon to surrender, he answered in the fulness of his scorn that he was not born to accept of favour from 'base rogues and rebels,' and irritated by this return, as the said rogues thought, of insolence for clemency, they speedily numbered him with the slain.

Loyalty like that of Northampton, the effect almost entirely of early feeling and association, prevailed widely, we may perhaps say generally, with his party. It was commonly the ally of a chivalrous courage, which, like itself, partook more of ardour than reflection, and, in some instances, as in the case of Sir Bevil Grenvil, was wedded to dispositions the most honourable and generous. The gentleman last mentioned closed his short career at the battle of Lansdown. His brother, Sir Richard Grenvil, long survived : the worthy being taken, and the worthless left. This Sir Richard was a man without principle or humanity, both

in public and private life. Treachery, cruelty, and rapine, seem to have been his element. He affected to be a zealous parliamentarian until the moment arrived in which he might betray his party with the greatest advantage to himself; and from that time his military talent sufficed to procure him frequent employment in important trusts, until the complaints preferred against him from all parts, and his refusal to obey the orders of the Prince of Wales, led to his dismissal. In Ireland, and through the West of England, he was accustomed to fine, imprison, and execute on the most false and frivolous pretences. He saw five men leaving a coppice near Plymouth, bearing away bundles of fire-wood without permission, and he spared the life of one, on condition of his hanging the other four upon the spot. In Ireland he dragged the aged from their beds to hang them in front of their own dwellings, on the charge of refusing to discover their treasures. Monstrous as this may seem, even this man had his friends in the royal household, and in the army, who raised loud complaints at his being put aside; and Charles himself bestowed upon him large estates in the West, belonging to Lord Roberts, and to the Earl of Bedford. All these facts we learn from Clarendon.

Lord Wilmot shared too largely in the license which disgraced the conduct of Sir Richard Grenvil; but was not chargeable with his want of honour, and was much less disposed to cruelty or oppression. He was in fact a finished cavalier, excelling in the gaiety, the address, and the good fellowship, which distinguished that character, and was a royalist as the consequence principally of being a complete man of fashion. He was active and courageous, but his impatient temper unfitted him for taking a comprehensive view of affairs, and gave so much uncertainty to his judgment, that his views to-day, were always liable to be changed by new considerations to-morrow. His agreeable manners gave him considerable influence in the army, particularly with the cavalry; but his ambition and vacillation made him an object of distrust even with his friends, and exposed him to so many instances of mortification, that he withdrew from the war some time before its close. In the reign of Charles II. Wilmot is but too well known as the licentious Lord Rochester.

Prince Rupert and Wilmot rarely agreed, except when some censure was to be passed on persons who interfered with military operations without experience in them. The prince had grown up a military adventurer amidst the wars of Germany, and brought more impetuosity than discretion to his intercourse with society, and to his duties as a soldier. His self-confidence was boundless, and his bearing toward those with whom he acted, haughty and reckless. But his never-failing courage, his military skill, and his exhaustless energy, raised him to the chief command

after the second battle of Newbury. The liberties of the country were with him a matter of no concern. He would have laid them prostrate at a stroke. We scarcely need remind our readers that Rupert was nephew to the king. When the issues of the war compelled him to leave the country, he betook himself to the sea, partly for the purpose of inflicting damage on the commerce and navy of the Island, and partly with the hope of facilitating the introduction of succours to the royalists from the continent. His powers of mischief, however, were too narrowly watched to be exercised with much effect.

When we turn from men of this description to some of their confederates, it is not difficult to fix on those concerning whom a very different language may be employed. Such persons were the Earl of Carnarvon, Sir Jacob Astley, and Sir Ralph Hopton, all of whom appear to have become parties to the war from a conviction of its social justice, their conduct being such on all occasions as to bespeak their high sense of honour, and their opposition to all unnecessary severity. The Earl of Carnarvon was a nobleman whose parts had been cultivated by study, but much more by travel, in which he had indulged to a greater extent than was usual in that age, even with persons of his rank. His conduct previous to the beginning of the war had not been without its license and frivolities; but infirmities of that sort all disappeared as he became engaged in the great national conflict. He possessed much of the courage which distinguished Rupert, but with it a self-possession in action which that otherwise expert captain was never to acquire. His early death, in 1643, was, in many respects, a sensible loss to his party. Sir Jacob Astley was a man of few words, but added to his excellent moral qualities great promptitude and energy as a soldier. The want of the same readiness and decision was almost the only defect in the character of Sir Ralph Hopton; and on this account, he never rose to those more responsible offices in the army, that might, on every other account, have been safely committed to him. His understanding, though good, seemed to be deficient in the grasp and quickness necessary to satisfy his moral scruples, and to give steadiness to his plans. His industry was unceasing, and he stood alone among his coadjutors in the exhaustless generosity of his temper. On the whole, Sir Ralph Hopton was the most popular man in the army; and that he was so, is a circumstance which speaks more to the credit of that body, than almost any other in its history, since we learn from Clarendon that he was a man who 'abhorred enough the license and levities with which he saw too many corrupted.'

The terms in which history has spoken of these estimable men, may be applied with little modification to Sir George Lisle, and Lord Capel, who became prisoners on the surrender of

Colchester, in 1647. Lisle, who always displayed the most admirable courage in the field, so as to inspire his followers, almost beyond any man, with the sort of confidence which so often leads to success, is said to have been one of the most mild and amiable of mankind in his general manners. In common with Capel, he appears to have governed by a loyalty more the effect of conventional and hereditary feeling, than of any intelligent principle. But nothing could be more generous or devoted than the service which these persons rendered to their sovereign. Capel joined the king at York: he had been a stranger to the court previously; but from that time placed the ties which bound him to an affectionate wife, and an interesting family of children, in constant subjection to his sense of public duty. These excellent men suffered death, as offenders against an ordinance which had declared all parties who should appear in arms against the existing government, liable to the penalties of treason.

Over the northern counties, until the battle of Marston-Moor, the chief command was vested in the Earl of Newcastle, a nobleman whose time had been given to poetry and music, and to some kindred amusements, more than to the command of armies, or the study of politics; and whose mind, moulded by no independent reflection, but wholly by the circumstance of birth and station, made its selection, as matter of course, on the side of monarchy and the church, those institutions being regarded as supports of each other, and of his own order. By the influence, and the ample resources of the Earl of Newcastle, a formidable army was soon brought together for the purpose of securing the northern counties in their allegiance; nor was he to be removed from that quarter of the kingdom by any of the exigences which pressed elsewhere, though commands to that effect sometimes came in the name of the king. This spirit of insubordination, led to serious differences between the earl and Prince Rupert, on the eve of the battle of Marston-Moor; and after the disastrous issue of that day the earl consulted his taste by relinquishing the profession of arms, and his safety by leaving the kingdom.

In the course of this very general view of the character of the men who acted with more or less efficiency as royalists, mention should be made of the Duke of Richmond, and of the Lords Pawlet and Seymour. Richmond was related to the king, and was much indebted to the royal favour and bounty. On the breaking out of the troubles in Scotland, he opposed the popular feeling with so little consideration as to make himself very obnoxious. But while his temper disposed him to act with decision, his want of judgment, or of moral courage, exposed him to much hesitation in regard to the best means by which to seek the accomplishments of his wishes; and he failed, on this account, to produce any feeling of confidence in the minds he was sometimes

concerned to influence. He attended the remains of the king when laid in the royal chapel at Windsor, having expended the greater part of his fortune in support of the war.

The Lords Pawlet and Seymour were persons of much influence in the western counties; and acted with advantage to the royal cause in that division of the kingdom during the early part of this contest. Seymour was brother to the Marquis of Hertford; and if he brought less activity and energy to the duties of his profession than Pawlet, the cause may be found in his case, as in that of many beside,—in the strength of his attachment to domestic and private life. Of Sir Marmaduke Langdale little more can be said, than that he was, perhaps, a better soldier than either of these persons, and a devoted royalist. Of the Earl of Derby, too, it may suffice to say, that he was a nobleman of integrity and courage, but as remarkable for his pride as for his loyalty. The former passion made him a person of little influence, the latter as every history records, cost him his life.

The names we have mentioned include, we believe, all the royalists who were distinguished by their talent or conduct during the civil war. The king could boast of many more who brought with them the influence of rank and fortune, but who had little beside to place at his disposal. Such were the Earls of Leicester and Salisbury, during the short time in which they could be regarded as royalists: men whose titles lead the imagination back to the times of the great men who rose high in the councils of Elizabeth, and in the enterprizes of her reign. But Charles saw little in the possessors of those titles to remind him of the splendour and power which had distinguished the men from whom they were derived. The Earl of Berkeshire, and Lord Dunsmore, were men of no capacity or influence; the former was indebted to his connexion with Southampton, who had married his daughter, for the little respect paid to him—and, with the exception, perhaps, of Sir Charles Lucas, was the least endurable specimen of ill temper to be found in his party. Concerning Lord Ferdinando Hastings, sixth Earl of Huntingdon, we only know that he joined the royal standard soon after it was set up at Nottingham, and was among the first to run away from it at Edgehill. The Earl of Westmoreland gave in his adhesion to the royal cause at York, but whether he did anything either in the council or the field to make his adhesion of value, we find not. The same may be said of Lord Rich, and of the Earl of Newport; and Lord Rivers is distinguished from these personages only as having made himself in some way more obnoxious to the Parliament. The Earl of Bath appears to have been one of those little calculators, who sometimes find, that there are occasions when a rash ultraism, would not have been so costly as hollow pretences to neutrality. Lord Mohun, also, seems to have been

much inclined to this trimming school of politicians. Lord Conway, whose valorous doings at Newburn left him little chance of being trusted with any military enterprise, chose to act the spy at Westminster, until it became necessary to his safety that he should seek an asylum in Oxford, where, the treason having served its purpose, the traitor was allowed to sink into obscurity. Of Lord Newark, we can report little more than that he was deemed worthy of a place among the royal commissioners during the treaty of Uxbridge. Herbert, better known as Earl of Glamorgan, and afterwards as Marquis of Worcester, was a person of more consideration than any of these parties. Though a Catholic, he was entrusted by the king with the command of the forces raised in South Wales; but, he is best known to us by the part he was induced to take in the treacherous negotiation between Charles and the confederate Catholics in Ireland in 1645. It is evident that the king placed much confidence in the ability and integrity of Glamorgan, though in the affairs of Ireland he suffered much from his well meant exertions. The Earl of Monmouth was son to one of that class of persons who, in their idolatry of a court, forget that they have a country, and who do homage to the idol of their choice for one avowed object—self-advancement. We know of nothing in the history of the second Earl of Monmouth tending to show that he was any great improvement on the first. We only know that his dignity died with him. In an enumeration of this sort, mention should be made of Lord Jermyn—a gentleman who knew how to please the queen, and who, building on that stock of merit, appears to have supposed that it was only necessary to make the effort in order to please every body else. He sometimes drew his sword in the cause of the king, but was much more at home in the little gallantries and intrigues of a court, than in the service of the camp, or the conduct of affairs. Sir John Berkeley also was a courtier, and nothing more. Ashburnham was a feeble person, of the same class, and not capable of any efficiency even in that character.

So great was the diversity of character, among the persons who became associated for the one object of aiding the king in his effort to lower the pretensions of the Parliament. But the attraction of the one object which had brought these parties together, was not such as to render them of one mind in regard to the manner in which it should be pursued. Divided counsels were inseparable from so much difference in ability and temper; loyalty becoming subordinate, too frequently, to faction and intrigue. The letters of the king, and the general correspondence of the age, show that Charles had to lament the prevalence of these evils among his followers from the beginning, and that he found them multiply as he became familiar with difficulties and reverses. Officers and men looked on their position about

the sovereign as the result of their own free choice ; and there was, in consequence, more of self-will in their proceedings, than of that prompt obedience which is of so much importance to the success of military operations. Measures concerted amidst jarring counsels not unfrequently proved disastrous, as at the siege of Gloucester, and then the time and energy that should have been employed in repairing the injury, were wasted, or rather much worse than wasted, in the work of recrimination. Men not accustomed to have to do with their fellows in circumstances somewhat similar, can form but an inadequate idea of the trial to which the constancy of the wiser and better meaning must have been exposed by such occurrences. The necessity of humouring ignorance, conceit, selfishness, and ill-temper, is, at all times, a hard necessity, but especially so when the object at stake is felt to be of the greatest moment.

It is observable in this retrospect, that the royalists of most general ability, were, for the greater part, men of moderate views. Such were Falkland, Southampton, Hertford, Hopton, and Astley. We cannot assign Clarendon or Digby a place in this honourable list ; and the loyalty of Capel, of Lisle, and of some others of the same class, was too indiscriminate to merit the praise of wisdom or sobriety. It is equally evident, however, that the notions of these less considerate men, which were of course the more dangerous from being frequently allied with a reputation for integrity and talent, represented the feeling of the royalist army more nearly than those of their less partial coadjutors, and would no doubt have prevailed in the future counsels of the monarch had he been successful in the field. The language in which this party was accustomed to speak of their opponents, accorded more with that which the king was always disposed to employ ; and while their patriotism or their policy would have led them to recommend a sober and salutary exercise of the prerogative, they would gladly have restored that instrument of so much misrule to its full power as in the days of the Tudors, heedless of any custom or statute that might seem to point to such power as a gross usurpation on the liberties of the people. Southampton witnessed so much of this spirit, that, next to the absolute prostration of the royalists, he would have lamented their uncontrolled ascendancy. The attempt of the king to seize the five members is admitted by Hume as evidence of his insincerity in his previous compliances, and the obnoxious terms to which he clung with such hold during the war, when setting forth the character of his antagonists, could not but strengthen all their feelings of distrust.

We shall now endeavour to state, in few words, the testimony of history with regard to the character of some of those persons whose principles and conduct made them so little

acceptable to the sovereign. Among the peers who chose their place with the Parliament, when appeal was made to the sword, the most considerable were the Earls of Bedford, Northumberland, Pembroke, Essex, Manchester, and Warwick, and the Lords Say, Brooke, and Wharton.

William, Earl of Bedford, at the commencement of the war, must be distinguished from Francis, Earl of Bedford, who died while the fate of Strafford was pending. The former Earl, from his large wealth, his intelligence, and his moderation, was a person of great influence with the liberal party, and the medium of all important negociations between them and the court. He was attached to the constitution, both in church and state, but the enemy of all arbitrary power. His liberal contributions toward matters connected with the splendour and welfare of the church, and the urbanity of his deportment toward the ruling churchmen, gave him a place in the favour of many who lamented his opposition to the persecuting laws against the non-conformist clergy, and the popular temper of his political preferences. At the time of his death, he was much occupied in endeavouring to reconcile his party to something less than capital punishment in the case of the Earl of Strafford, as the price of their own elevation to the offices of government. The next Earl of Bedford possessed neither the judgment, nor the decided sympathy with liberal principles, which distinguished his predecessor. He became General of the Horse under the Parliament, and fought in that capacity at Edgehill, but displayed little aptitude for such a trust on any occasion, and withdrew to the court the following year. The reception given to him there, and also to the Earl of Clare and the Earl of Holland, who accompanied him, was cold and distrustful. He was engaged on the side of the king in the first battle of Newbury, where he gave proof of courage, and subsequently made some advances in the royal favour; but returned soon afterwards to the Parliament, professing to have been much more dissatisfied with the course of affairs at Oxford, than with any thing he had witnessed at Westminster. The Earl of Clare joined him in this return to his former confederates, and the Earl of Holland, not finding, as we have before remarked, the advancement among his old friends which his vanity had taught him to expect, followed their example.

It is said, but is more matter of conjecture than certainty, that this injudicious treatment of these fickle personages, prevented the manifestation of a similar defection on the part of the Earl of Northumberland. Clarendon speaks of this nobleman as a person who, in 1641, possessed 'the most esteemed and unblemished reputation, in court and country, of any person of his rank throughout the kingdom.' His separation from the court at that time, did much to confirm the reports

which were so widely circulated to its prejudice. Charles had conferred on him the order of the garter, had raised him to a place in the privy council, and, in 1637, had made him Lord High Admiral; in short, there were few persons whom the king had appeared to regard with so much esteem and confidence. So decided, however, was the stand which he made in favour of popular liberty, that he did not scruple to declare in the Upper House, that all persons opposed to the measure which required that the military power of the country should be placed at the disposal of Parliament, were enemies to the commonwealth. During the change, intrigue, and violence, which followed, he no doubt saw much on both sides to disapprove; but he never forsook the cause of the Parliament, and so long as any fragment of the Upper House remained, appeared in his place. His opponents found so much difficulty in accounting for his conduct in any manner agreeable to themselves, that they commonly spoke of it as the effect of his being the proudest man in England, incapable of doing homage to a superior even in the person of his sovereign. But it should be remembered that it was the father of the present nobleman, who, as Earl of Northumberland, had been placed under arrest on suspicion of being concerned in the gunpowder treason. The heavy fine, and long imprisonment, imposed on the ground of that suspicion, were not likely to produce any strong attachment to the house of Stuart, or to leave the sufferer insensible to the evils of a government by prerogative and by such engines as the star-chamber, in the place of a government by law: and the son may be well excused if found manifesting a sympathy in this respect with his sire. He is described as a person of graceful presence, though we do not derive this impression from the representation of him by Vandyke. The greatest decorum was observable in his general conduct, and in the government of his household; and the same idea of regularity, and habitual self-control, was conveyed by his measured conversation, and by the manner in which he acquitted himself in debate. His observations, which were never trivial or impertinent, appear to have derived much weight from the deliberation which characterized his manner as a speaker, and which tended to strengthen the favourable estimate generally entertained with regard to his understanding and integrity. In the dispute between the army and parliament in 1647, he withdrew to the former, not with the view of setting up the power of the sword, but in the hope of accomplishing a more equitable settlement by means of the council of officers, and the independent minority which accompanied him from the Commons, than could be expected from the king, or from the presbyterian majority which ruled at Westminster. It was natural, when all such expedients had failed, that a man who could boast of having the blood of

Charlemagne in his veins, should concur in the measures which led to the restoration of the exiled family.

Of the Earl of Pembroke we have spoken elsewhere. The Earl of Essex was a person of much higher reputation. Before the meeting of the Long Parliament Essex had been engaged in the Palatine war, and in the service of the United Provinces. His strong feeling as a Protestant, which led him to the Palatinate, was connected with an ardent love of liberty. No argument or persuasion could prevail on him to concur in the adoption of any middle course toward Strafford; and when the moment for unsheathing the sword arrived, no man hazarded his life more willingly in the cause of the Parliament. His enemies were constrained to speak of him as a person devoid of all selfish ambition; as little concerned about titles or preferments of any sort; as constant and ingenuous in his friendships; and as incapable of a dishonourable action toward his greatest enemy, or for the sake of any possible object. His great defect, according to these persons, was a weakness of judgment, which taught him to think too favourably of his confederates, and of their intentions, and also of his own power to control the elements which he did much to put into motion. But these errors, if such they may be called, were those of a generous nature, and such as a wiser man in the same circumstances might well have entertained. The two houses, by a unanimous vote, appointed him commander-in-chief of the army raised by their authority, and he entered upon his high trust amidst the acclamations of his whole party. He felt, however, in regard to the power of the Parliament, much as Southampton, and some others, felt in regard to the power of the king,—and was, in consequence, more desirous of augmenting it only so far as might be necessary to secure a salutary adjustment of the questions at issue, than of seeking the absolute ascendancy of either party. But it was soon found that the slow hesitating policy which was the natural effect of such views, tended to hold the war in a perpetual oscillation, rather than to bring about a peace of any kind. It was to put an end to this timid and dangerous policy that the self-denying ordinance was passed, the immediate effect of which was to deprive all the then existing members of parliament, and Essex among the rest, of their military commissions, leaving them, at the same time, eligible to subsequent re-election at the pleasure of the two Houses. There is reason to believe that this proceeding was not agreeable to Essex, and the Parliament endeavoured to guard against his probable displeasure by recording its grateful testimony to his past services. He had indeed always acquitted himself with fidelity and courage; and though he lived to see the constitution in church and state broken in upon to a much greater extent than he approved, he never betrayed the slightest disposition to forsake his

old friends. He died in the early part of 1646, and was honoured with a stately funeral at the charge of the nation.

The Earl of Manchester possessed all the integrity, the sense of honour, the love of freedom, and the manly generosity of temper, by which Essex was distinguished, and excelled him in the urbanity of his manners, and in a polished mildness of sentiment, which he retained unimpaired amidst the excess and violence inseparable from civil war. No man drew his sword with greater confidence in the justice of the cause in which it was to be employed, and no man was more concerned to limit the evils attendant on such contests by every possible exercise of humanity and courtesy. On his first appearance in public life, he was known as Lord Mandeville; and subsequently, through the influence of Buckingham, with whom he had become connected by marriage, he was raised to the peerage during the life-time of his father, as baron of Kimbolton. Soon after the death of Buckingham, he married a daughter of the Earl of Warwick; and, during the twelve years of misrule which preceded the Long Parliament, he entered so fully into the spirit of the popular party, that we find Lord Kimbolton the only peer impeached by the king with the five members. In religion, he was a Presbyterian, and if liable to censure at all, it was mainly on the ground of his leaning too readily to the side of intolerance, from his sympathy with that party. He was also of the same mind with those who were not so much desirous of conquest, as of that moderate amount of advantage, which they flattered themselves would suffice to bring about the most desirable settlement. The course of events tended very soon to show the fallacy of such hopes, and he would at any time have gladly resigned a commission, which he had accepted with reluctance, and which demanded a sort of ability and experience that his modesty and good sense would not allow him to suppose he possessed. But to be removed by the self-denying ordinance was so little palatable to him, that he retired from that time to private life, and kept himself wholly free from the struggle of parties, until the moment arrived for restoring the monarchy in the person of Charles II. Of Manchester, as of Falkland, we may say, that he was so far a wise and good man, as generally to discern where the path of justice and humanity lay, and was disposed, in ordinary times, to walk in it; but he lacked that deeper knowledge of human nature, and that firm texture of intellect, which was so necessary to the steady prosecution of a great object, when it is not only opposed by the most determined and reckless temper on the part of the enemy, but placed, perhaps, at imminent hazard by the weakness or treachery of avowed friends. The infirmities of our poor nature do not often take the sagacious by surprise, and

hence it does not often happen that they are chargeable with the folly of beginning to build without being able to finish.

The Earl of Warwick evinced much more perseverance in the popular cause than Manchester, but not as the effect of being in any respect a greater man. Tenacity of purpose may result from the various influence of circumstances, temper, habit, and narrow views, as well as from extraordinary compass and power of mind. While Laud was employing all the machinery of oppression to put down the puritans, the Earl of Warwick opened his doors to the silenced and persecuted clergy of that class, and always manifested a preference for the ministry of such persons. Not that his disposition, or manners, were those of the austere sect whom he thus took under his patronage. On the contrary, the wit and pleasantry of his conversation, were of so free a description as to make his religion very doubtful in the esteem of the men who found in him so valuable a benefactor, and sufficed to place that question beyond all uncertainty with the court clergy, and the royalists generally. But that he was a man of no virtue, as is loosely affirmed by Clarendon, does not appear from the facts of his history. An opposite inference, indeed, should be drawn from that source so far as it is known to us, and particularly from the great influence which it is admitted he possessed, both in parliament, and in all those parts of the country where he was best known. In fact, there is no room to question the fixed honesty of his political professions; and the position of the puritan clergy as persecuted men, the manifest sincerity of their religious character, and the measure of attachment to the principles of general liberty which they always discovered, gave them a firm hold on his sympathy and respect, which he did not scruple to avow in a manner that bespoke his fearless integrity, and a susceptibility of generous feeling. He accepted the office of Lord High Admiral from the hands of Parliament; and when the monarchy and his own order were declared useless, he maintained a fast friendship with Cromwell, one of the latest acts of his life being to give his eldest son in marriage to a daughter of the Protector.

There was nothing of the pleasantry of Warwick in the manner of Lord Say. He betrayed, on the contrary, some leaning towards harshness and severity;—in part, we may suppose, as the effect of natural temper, and in part as the result of contemplating with admiration those stern models of public virtue in the annals of Greece and Rome, with which his acknowledged scholarship had made him familiar. Something also of the same effect was no unnatural consequence of being obliged to regard himself, through so long a period, as thrown upon evil times. His entrance on public life was a little previous to the juncture when Buckingham thought well to assume the language of the patriot, and the favourite professed himself anxious to obtain the

assistance of so wise a head in prosecuting his new policy. But two natures less adapted for co-operation could hardly have been brought together. Say spoke of the experience of antiquity as a school of instruction in the mystery of government; and that, in the esteem of the shallow personage whom the king delighted to honour, was to become a pedant. He dwelt also on the necessity of carrying out certain vigorous plans of reformation and improvement, but to act on such bold projects was to revolutionize the state, and to hazard its existence. All hope of any change for the better by means of such an instrument being vain, Say turned from the court to the country, and watched with solicitude every incident which seemed to promise that the time would come in which it might be possible to place the arbitrary temper of the government under some wholesome control. During the gloomy interval from 1628 to 1640, no man did so much to sustain the hopes, and to regulate the proceedings of the popular party through the kingdom; nor was his reputation as a person of eminent capacity, of sound views, and of great firmness of temper, confined to that party. In parliament, he always spoke with effect, and was the first peer who declared against episcopacy. But in dispensing with the bishops, he was far from meaning to destroy the whole fabric of the church, as Clarendon is pleased to assert; nor was it ever his purpose to detract from the real strength of the monarchy or of the peerage. The king, however, learnt to regard him as so hostile to the just pretensions of the crown, that in a royal proclamation issued soon after the commencement of war, the name of Say appears in a list of persons excepted from pardon, and, on that account, he was refused a safe conduct when appointed by the parliament to treat with the royal commissioners at Oxford. His last effort to save the constitution was at the treaty of Newport, where, had his advice been taken, the king might have regained his throne, and, by degrees, as much of his power as would have been compatible with any feeling of safety on the part of his opponents. Say lived to see the Restoration, and the noble doings that followed.

Lord Brooke entered into the views of Say on all the points we have mentioned. He had not the same acquaintance with books, but participated more freely in the views and the spirit of the puritans, so as to be governed in his public conduct in a greater measure by his religious feelings. He not unfrequently prayed extempore in the presence of his chaplain and soldiers; and is described by Richard Baxter, as one of those superior natures who pass from the disorders of the best social system on earth, to contemplate the perfect economy of a celestial commonwealth. 'They who were acquainted with him,' says Clarendon, 'believed him to be well natured and just; and rather seduced and corrupted in his understanding, than perverse and malicious. Whether

his passions or conscience swayed him, he was, undoubtedly, one of those who could with most difficulty have been reconciled to the government of Church or State; and, therefore, his death was looked upon as no ill omen for peace; and was exceedingly lamented by that party; which had scarce a more absolute confidence in any man than in him.' He displayed great activity in Warwickshire, and in other parts of the kingdom, but was shot in 1643, when about to besiege a party of royalists who had taken possession of Lichfield cathedral. Charles named him in one of his proclamations as a person whom he had determined to prosecute for treason.

Of Lord Wharton, it may suffice to say, that he was a person of unblemished reputation, that he always acted with Brooke, and appears to have shared in his sentiments in nearly all respects. In the second year of the war, not more than twenty peers were in the habit of attending the upper house. Of this number we have mentioned seven, and of the remaining thirteen history has nothing very material to report:—they were, the Earls of Kent, Lincoln, Rutland, Salisbury, Suffolk, Mulgrave, Denbigh, Stamford, and Bolinbroke; and the Lords Dacres, Grey, of Warke, Willoughby, of Parham, Howard, of Eserick, Rochfort, and Roberts.

It is to the lower house that we must look for the men who were most aware of the extent and bearing of the principles involved in this contest, and who were alone capable of prosecuting their objects with vigour in the hour of disaster, and amidst the infirmities and changes of popular feeling. The conduct of the king on his return from Scotland, could not fail to generate strong suspicion with regard to the fair promises which were so freely made by him soon afterwards; and the popular leaders were accordingly resolved, as we have before observed, on preventing any settlement, which should leave their own fate, or that of the constitution, dependent on the temper of the monarch. This determination they avowed freely in their private conferences, and it appeared in effect in all their documents and proceedings. To question the general integrity of their conduct in acting on this policy, is to dispose of evidence so as to reduce the story of the past to a chaos of uncertainties. Something of the humane regard which served, in many cases, to sober the ardent adherence felt by these men to the public interests, we may perceive in a letter addressed to Sir Ralph Hopton, by his old friend Sir William Waller—an able parliamentary general, whose successes at the commencement of the war procured him the name of William the Conqueror. Hopton solicited an interview, after the two friends had drawn the sword on opposite sides. Waller returns for answer; 'My affections to you are so unchangeable, that hostility itself cannot violate my friendship to your per-

‘son, but I must be true to the cause wherein I serve. I should wait on you according to your desire, but that I look on you as engaged in that party beyond the possibility of retreat, and consequently incapable of being wrought upon by any persuasion. That great God, who is the searcher of all hearts, knows with what a sad fear I go upon this service, and with what perfect hate I detest a war without an enemy. But I look upon it as *opus Domini*! We are both on the stage, and must act those parts that are assigned to us in this tragedy; but let us do it in the way of honour, and without personal animosity.’ And from what we know of Hopton, we may well believe, he shared fully in his friend’s high sense of duty, and in the generous reluctance that attended the performance of the service which it inspired.

On no character in our history have the enemies of freedom looked with a more evil eye than upon John Hampden. His good points stand out so beautifully, and his too short, career was so singularly cautious and faultless, as to render him a most unwelcome object to the diseased vision of his assailants. It is, indeed, a rare thing to meet with a patriotism so bold and determined, in alliance with so much reflection, self-possession, and urbanity. The several parts of his character might be found in different men in many countries, but where to look for them all combined in such admirable proportions we hardly know. Mr. D’Israeli’s labours have tended rather to augment than diminish the fame of this extraordinary person; particularly, by showing that his religion, instead of consisting of the ‘mysterious jargon, and vulgar hypocrisy,’ which Hume has imputed to him and his coadjutors, was a system which embraced the most lofty theism, chastened and regulated by the discoveries peculiar to Christianity, and expressed on ordinary occasions in a language which the most refined taste must approve. Warburton has justly observed, that Clarendon’s account of Hampden shows, in every line, that the historian believed him to be a man of virtue and honour, but acting upon wrong principles—that is, upon principles which led him to assert the rights of the parliament, and to limit the power of the crown so far as should appear necessary to preserve the liberties of the community against future injuries from that quarter. But we find nothing in the solemn reasoning of the historian, or in the boisterous dogmatism of his commentator, to satisfy us that the principles of the patriot were at all more vulnerable than his conduct. Clarendon describes Hampden as the most popular man in parliament, at a time when he is obliged himself to acknowledge, that the Commons manifested ‘a most excellent spirit.’ But when the crisis arrived in which the historian and the patriot chose different sides, the wisdom of the latter is described as ‘cunning, deep design,’ and ‘craft;’ his self government and courtesy become a ‘mask;’ his opposition to the

court, the effect of a determination to reign over it, and, in part, because not admitted, with others, to a place of trust there; while his ability in council; his address as a speaker; his skill in governing individuals and parties; and his rare admixture of forethought and activity, are all viewed as so many attributes empowering him to do 'mischief.' When 'the chancellor of human nature,' was employed in furnishing this elaborate and artful account of the mind of Hampden, he was far, we may suppose, from suspecting the kind of curiosity that would be presented to the men of future times by this working of his own. It is plain, from all that he has said about Hampden, that he had no real fault to lay to his charge; and that in the total absence of facts to his mind, he restricted himself to the kind of insinuations that may be conveyed by single terms, or by that artful mode of expression which leads the unsuspecting to conclusions which it would not be expedient directly to assert. Much of this wily course of proceeding we may put down to prejudice; but more, to a narrow feeling of mortification, on seeing so much worth on the side of an enemy. Falkland, more calm, and less liable to be misled by ill-regulated feeling than Clarendon, always judged more correctly of the character of Hampden.

Among the leading men of that age who did a willing homage to the almost faultless combination of intellectual and moral qualities in the character of Hampden, particular mention should be made of Pym—a statesman whose influence in the Commons and the capital was so great, after the meeting of the Long Parliament, as to have procured him among his enemies, the sarcastic appellation of 'king Pym.' Mr. Forster has done good service by concentrating our hitherto scattered information relating to the history of this distinguished patriot. Pym was a native of Bedfordshire, and educated in Pembroke College, Oxford. Under the patronage of the Earl of Bedford, he obtained a place in the Exchequer, and a seat in the parliaments of 1614 and 1620. In the year 1614, he was committed to the Tower, with Coke and Selden, as the punishment of advocating the 'rights and franchise' of the Commons with a zeal which made him obnoxious to the crown. In our parliamentary history of the next thirty years his name is of constant occurrence, and his course as a public man exhibits no shadow of change, except that of a growing attachment to the principles of his early days. In the short parliament of 1640, and in the long parliament soon afterwards assembled, he made his appearance with the reputation of possessing admirable talents for business, and a better acquaintance than any other man with all the forms of parliamentary proceedings. His physical, as well as his mental energies, were known to be extraordinary; and, together with his unsullied integrity, his searching and comprehensive views of public

questions, his leonine courage, his firmness of purpose, and his natural, earnest, and often most commanding eloquence, tended to place him in 1640 in the distinguished position which he filled from that time in the view of three kingdoms. He not only led the prosecutions against Strafford, to which scarcely any of his contemporaries would have been competent, but did more than any other person to urge his party onward, unawed by the opposition of the court, or the popular agitations of that crisis. Two years, however, of such labour as devolved on Pym subsequent to the death of Strafford, often leaving him not more than two hours of the twenty-four for repose, proved sufficient to break down even his capability of exertion. The beautiful Lady Carlisle, sister to the Earl of Northumberland, was the most conspicuous person in a numerous class of females, who meddled considerably in that age with political struggle and intrigue; and having, in order to gratify this unwomanly passion, cultivated the friendship of Strafford, she afterwards, for the same object, bestowed similar attention on Pym. That her acquaintance with either of these great men was formed with any impure intention, will not be supposed by those who are acquainted with the little we know concerning the history of that singular woman. Scandal, however, of this sort, was insinuated at the time; but that it was not credited by Baxter, is manifest from the confidence with which that strict divine has spoken of the religious character of this patriot, assigning him a place with Lord Brooke, in the better commonwealth of the skies; and, it is certain, that he died giving expression to sentiments which breathe the spirit of a sober Christianity and a sound patriotism.

Sir Harry Vane, who acted with so much effect during the twenty years which preceded the restoration, was son of the Privy Counsellor of the same name. Having graduated at Oxford, as a student of Magdalen College, he visited France, spent some time at Geneva, and returned to England much dissatisfied both with the worship and polity of the English church. The posture of affairs at that juncture afforded him little opportunity for diffusing his principles with any prospect of success, and he found no man more opposed to his uncourtly novelties than his father. But his nature was of that bold and ardent complexion, which generally creates occasions for action in one direction, if shut out from them in another. Under this impulse, Vane transported himself to New England, and so far commended himself to the exiled puritans and nonconformists of whom that colony was composed, as to be elected governor the year after his landing. There is reason to believe that his views at that time concerning the province of the magistrate in matters of religion, were in substance those which he defended with so much ability at a later period, and on that point the pious settlers in New England had still most of them something to learn. The majority were

not prepared to adopt his more perfect theory of liberty of conscience, though many embraced it with great earnestness, as the one thing necessary to the harmony and stability of their infant state. Vane, dissatisfied apparently with the measure of his success in the New World, soon returned to England; where he married a lady of good family; listened to the lectures of his father on the importance of avoiding all singularity of opinion or conduct; and, through his influence, was appointed treasurer of the navy. His subsequent friendship with Pym, and adherence to the popular party, are attributed by Clarendon to the 'disobligation' put upon his father, who coveted the title of Baron of Raby, but was doomed to see that honour conferred on Strafford. The historian, however, has said enough before concerning Vane, to place us in possession of a more adequate explanation of his conduct. The man who found his views on the subject of religious liberty but imperfectly realized in Geneva or New England, and who was withal a man not to be deterred from avowing his opinions by little calculations of loss or danger, was not a person to be long in deciding as to the choice which it became him to make when the struggle had really commenced between the parliament on the one side, and the crown and the hierarchy on the other. That he was 'a man of great natural parts, of quick conception, and very ready, sharp, and weighty expression;' and altogether an extraordinary person, is admitted by Clarendon. The same writer further describes him as a man of 'very profound dissimulation.' We have no knowledge, however, of any thing of this description, as proved against him, in reality so censurable as are some things of the same kind which Clarendon has proved against himself. In fact, the self-complacency of this statesman appears to have led him to the conclusion, that when he has once imputed duplicity to his opponents, the practice of that vice to almost any extent on his own part must become venial and even praiseworthy. We much suspect that the charge of concealment and cunning so often preferred in the 'History of the Rebellion' against the most virtuous men of those times, owes its origin, in a great degree, to the distrust which the patriots were soon obliged to entertain as to the political integrity of the author of that work. According to his own confession, he kept up the appearance of a coadjutor, that he might act with more effect as an enemy, by taking upon him the office of a spy; and the double dealer is not a man to be pleased with being outwitted. We do not mean to insinuate that Vane was a person of such nice moral sentiment as to be incapable of opposing craft to craft—the manner in which he conducted the treaty with the Scots, might, perhaps, be appealed to as showing the contrary. All we mean to affirm is, that he was not more a dissembler than almost any man of the same general capacity, and in the same circumstances,

would have been, and that Clarendon is, by no means, the individual entitled to cast the first stone at him on that account. On the whole, he was a man of good average virtue; an independent, from his hatred of all ecclesiastical intolerance; a republican, from the force of untoward circumstances, more than from abstract preference; and a visionary in theology, from having learnt to view religion as an object of feeling and imagination, more than of the understanding; the latter faculty, made to bear with so much force, in his case, on questions of policy, being rarely extended beyond that circle. As a religious reformer, his first position was that of an opponent of the bishops; his next, as an antagonist of the presbyterians, as soon as that party betrayed a disposition to act upon the persecuting policy of their predecessors. In regard to the state, his first object was the reformation of abuses; but as the anger of parties became more intense, he joined in the demand for new securities in the shape of inroads on the old landmarks of the constitution; and, in the end, avowed himself the advocate of a republic, as being the only available government which could hold forth to the people the promise of an equal liberty. He would have been a party to the deposition of the king, but was opposed to his execution. When, however, the commonwealth was established, it was pre-eminently the influence of his genius, industry, and generous example, that made it so formidable at home and abroad, and to the enmity which he thus incurred, we must attribute his judicial murder at the Restoration.

Oliver Saint-John, was one of the many persons who, while Charles governed without a parliament, were accustomed to hold private conferences on the state of affairs, in the hope of bringing back the constitution from its abeyance. Some political papers which passed between him and his friends exposed him at that time to trouble in the star-chamber. Soon afterwards, he distinguished himself as counsel for Hampden, in the case of ship-money. Subsequently, he was called into frequent practice on similar questions, which made him increasingly obnoxious to the court, and tended to strengthen his feeling of hostility against it. He was much confided in by the Earl of Bedford, and by nearly the whole of the liberal party, but was a man of extreme views from the beginning, gloomy in his aspect, and reserved and unamiable in his manners. His language when engaged in the prosecution of Strafford, bespoke him a person who would not scruple to put violence in the place of law, when any plausible excuse might be urged for so doing. He continued to influence the current of affairs, in some degree, until the ascendancy of Cromwell, always manifesting the same harsh uncompromising temper.

Saint-John excelled as a popular advocate. He had no pretension to the general erudition of Selden, or to the ecclesiastical learning of Prynne. The judicial and scholar-like impartiality of

the former, was not at all to his taste; and the impassioned temperament of the latter, particularly when referring to questions purely religious, was hardly more acceptable to him. Both these lawyers, however, were capable of producing strong impressions on the party with which they acted, though they rarely acted together. Prynne, as a leader of the presbyterians, imbibed their spirit of intolerance to the full. Selden was placed at the head of the Erastians, who would have destroyed priestly power of every sort by vesting all authority, both ecclesiastical and civil, in the hands of the magistrate. Prynne, indeed, was indebted to his sufferings under the tyranny of Laud, and to the dogged hardihood with which they were endured, for much of the respect which he enjoyed. Selden, who was known to be deficient in courage of that description, based his pretensions on his wider compass of knowledge, on his more comprehensive views, and on that tone of moderation which Prynne could never be induced to regard as a virtue. In short, the characters of these men, though, for another reason, we have mentioned them together, have more in contrast than in common.

When fighting the battles of presbyterianism in the commons, Prynne was accustomed to look for aid to Denzil Hollis, and Sir Philip Stapleton. Hollis was the youngest son of the Earl of Clare, and had so far distinguished himself as an opponent of Buckingham in the parliament of 1628, as to have suffered considerably from the resentment of the court. In the new House of Commons assembled in 1640, he was much esteemed, as a man of courage, of accomplished parts, and liberal views. He took no part in the prosecution of Strafford, the earl having been the husband of his sister; but in other respects, he manifested so much opposition to the late government, that the name of Hollis occurs in the list of the five members impeached by the king. Nothing, however, could reconcile him to the self-denying ordinance; and no sooner was that regulation passed, than he gave abundant proof that neither his attachment to presbyterianism, nor his aversion to the court, were at all so strong as his hatred of the independents, and of their kindred sectaries. He retained his place, indeed, as a leader of the Presbyterians so long as it was possible, but principally because he regarded that body as the only power by means of which it would be possible to bring the king to reasonable terms, on the one hand, and to crush the Independents on the other. But he did not acquit himself well in this new position. The ungenerous scorn with which he treated the army, always describing them as a mere band of mercenaries, contributed not a little to place the sovereign power in the hands of the council of officers. As that crisis approached, he withdrew to France. Sir Philip Stapleton, who had acted with him in all his measures, but without being remarkable for either good or evil, or for talent of

any kind, followed his example, and died soon afterwards at Calais.

From the time when the military become ascendant, the reins of government pass virtually, if not formally, from the hands of senators to those of soldiers. But those soldiers were still citizens, and such as no nation in Europe beside had seen. We have already occupied so much greater space with this subject than we had intended, that we must not touch upon the character of the military chiefs, who come into prominence as we approach the time of the commonwealth. Were we to speak at all of Cromwell, we should be disposed to do so at some length, inasmuch as we regard a full and impartial view of the character of that extraordinary man as still a want in our literature; and with regard to the characters of his leading coadjutors in the field, we know not where to look for them developed and grouped with an adequate degree of attention and fairness. Viewed in connexion with the masses whom they governed, the mind of such men as Ludlow, Hutchinson, Ireton, Lambert, Fleetwood, and Harrison, is among the most instructive matters presented to us in the history of that remarkable period.

But, according to one class of politicians, the lesson pre-eminently conveyed by the reign of Charles the First, is that which points to the necessity of always looking toward the popular elements of the constitution with the greatest possible degree of watchfulness and suspicion. That our weak point is *there*, is said to have been clearly demonstrated by the events of that period. We are, however, unreasonable enough to believe that nothing can be more fallacious than the narrow hasty reasoning which has led to this conclusion. We should rather say, that the great lesson suggested to rulers by the occurrences of that age, is one which calls upon them to regulate their course by a due regard to the land-marks of law and usage; and to exercise their high powers, even within those limits, with caution and moderation; and one pointing, above all, to the importance of a character for sincerity and truth-keeping, in the case of the governing, no less than of the governed. It is mainly to the neglect of such things that we must look for the origin of popular excesses. It would not be hard to show that the extent and permanence of such disorders have been determined in nearly all cases by the prevalence and power of the causes we have mentioned. In time of commotion, if parties are without a character for truth, the ground for mutual trust is wanting, there can be no equal adjustment, and nothing remains, but conquest to the one side, and subjection to the other—and when this issue is realized, a state of society exists which has ever been incompatible with equal laws or good government. All these causes of inquietude, convulsion, and disaster, are but too manifest in the character and proceedings of the king, and of many, who, from time to time,

exerted much influence over him. We say not that his opponents were faultless; but we would be understood distinctly to affirm, that the excesses of democracy in that age, were the natural effect of previous excesses elsewhere; and that those high-minded politicians, whose ruling passion would seem to be the fear of their fellows, if they would provide against the occurrence of such evils, have only to be careful not to furnish occasion for them.

Art. II. *Home Education.* By the Author of 'Natural History of Enthusiasm.' Large 12mo. London: Jackson and Walford. 1838.

A WORK upon almost any subject from this popular writer, would command public attention; and we are glad that, in the present volume, he has invited it to a topic of the first importance, and treated it, as it ought to be treated, not rhetorically, but practically. The subject deeply concerns every parent, whatever course or system of education he may propose to adopt for his children; and the principles and method of instruction expounded in this work, are deserving of the consideration of every private and every public teacher.

Mr. Taylor does not attempt to decide in favour of Home Education as abstractedly and universally preferable to the opposite system, or as practicable by the generality of families; and he has shown his good sense in not making war upon schools and school discipline. In fact, all education worthy of the name, must *begin* at home; and it may be practicable to combine home education and school education, not only by making the one succeed to the other at a period sufficiently advanced to allow the initial development of the faculties to be completed by domestic culture, but, by means of day-schools and preparatory schools, they may be rendered collateral. It is no disparagement of school education, to say, that it cannot take the place, or supply the want of home education; any more than it derogates from the importance and value of the public ministry, that it cannot make up for the want of religious education and domestic example. Too much may be devolved upon the pastor, as upon the schoolmaster, through the criminal neglect, or incompetence, or vice of parents; and in either case, without attaching blame to the teacher, society must suffer in its vital interests from the prevalence of the mistake.

Were we called upon to discuss the comparative advantages of home and school education, there is a previous question which would demand our consideration, and which we wish that the

Author had adverted to; a question relating to the rights of children and parental responsibility. Cowper has expressed a poet's feeling in the often cited line—

‘God made the country, and man made the town.’

Yet, town may, under many circumstances, be preferable to the country. So we may be allowed to say, God made families, man made schools,—without implying any condemnation of such subsidiary institutions. Still, the domestic economy being a part of the Divine constitution under which we are placed as subjects of the moral government of God, and parents being immediately responsible to God for the training and welfare of their offspring, it is a question not wholly unreasonable—‘Am I at liberty, as a parent, to devolve that responsibility upon a stranger? Can I discharge a parent's duty by proxy? Have I a right to send away a child from under my own eye, and to deviate so far from the law and design of the domestic economy as established by Infinite wisdom? Can I answer to God for sending my child to school?’ That these questions will admit, in perhaps a majority of cases, of being conscientiously answered in the affirmative, we will not dispute; but, admitting this, it does not follow that they ought not to be put, or that the affirmative ought to be taken for granted. We cannot but deem it of vast importance, that the sending of a child from home in order to be educated by the public step-father, should at least be determined upon religiously, with a distinct recognition of the right of the child to have its happiness consulted in the arrangement, and with the consciousness on the part of the parents that they are transferring their proper business and duty to another, without thereby discharging themselves from accountability to God for the results. The question would be a startling one, in many cases, and, if brought home to the conscience, would often lead at least to the postponement of the child's exile from the native sphere of his affections;—‘What right have you to decline the task which nature has imposed upon you? What crime has the poor child committed, that deserves to be visited with this penalty?’ The answer would be, that it is sent to school, not as a punishment, but for its benefit—it will be happier at school; happier, undoubtedly, than in being spoiled at home, whether by blind and selfish fondness or by mistaken and indolent severity. Keeping a child from school, does not insure its being *educated* at home.

‘If there be not,’ remarks the present writer, ‘in the natural dispositions of parents and children, kindly warmth of feeling enough to effect implicit obedience by the means of the gentle affections, and without frequent recurrence to measures of severity, home education had better not be attempted. Children may be governed at school by

motives of fear, without entirely depraving their sentiments, because school is not their ALL ; they have still a home and a sphere of love to think of. But to rule them in any such way at home itself, is to wind out of their hearts, by a slow but certain process, every root and fibre of the affections ; nor will it fail to render them, in the seed, murky, obdurate, crafty, selfish, and malign. In mere mercy send children to school, who must be so schooled if kept at home.'—p. 62.

We can easily imagine that the perusal of this work, though illustrative of the superior advantages of a home education conducted upon sound principles, may lead some persons to decline an attempt for which they feel disqualified, and to decide, conscientiously and not unwisely, upon sending their children to school as the preferable method of training, under all the circumstances, though not absolutely the best. Even where the perusal leads to this determination, it will have a useful result. What we contend for is, that the disposal of a child for the all-important period of education ought not to be determined by light considerations or unworthy motives,—by an unintelligent deference to some inexorable law of custom or fashion,—by a wish to get rid of troublesome duties,—or by worldly and sordid calculations as to the chances of advantage in after life from school connexions. A step that may be justifiable as the result of due consideration, may be criminal if taken in sheer recklessness. The motive not only makes all the difference in the moral character of the action, but would give direction to it, by governing the parent's choice of the instructor to whom he should decide upon consigning the object of his anxiety. The schoolmaster's vocation and business would be viewed by parents in a far more honourable light, were the importance of the trust reposed in him duly appreciated. But a school is a school ; and if the boys are well fed, and *get on* in their learning, the generality of parents are well satisfied. Hence,

'Honourable as is the profession, and upright as may be the intentions of the teacher, there will, from obvious motives, be far more regard had to immediate and ostensible results, to the tangible product of the process of instruction, than to its remote influence and future effect, as bearing upon the adult development and actual employment of the faculties. Ordinary teachers, and even the most efficient and distinguished of them, must, almost inevitably, be impelled by the wish, whether confessed or not, to make it appear, and in no questionable manner, that they are fairly earning their remuneration, and are honestly rendering the *quid pro quo* to their employers. However conscious they may be of aiming always at the real advantage of their pupils, they can hardly have stoicism enough to sustain, in silence, the imputation, likely to be thrown upon them by inconsiderate and ignorant parents, of not having imparted an amount of learning equivalent to the stipend received.'—p. 11.

To an instructor of youth who has any adequate notions of the duties of his profession—a most honourable one when not taken up as a mere trade—and who unites to conscientiousness any sensibility of feeling, nothing is more discouraging and disgusting than the heartlessness with which children are, in a large proportion of cases, abandoned, rather than entrusted to them, and the thankless, grudging manner in which the account is discharged, as if the payment cancelled all obligation. For any reward beyond the pure satisfaction arising from the self-denying discharge of duty, such an instructor must look to the gratitude of his pupils, rather than of their fathers or mothers. But the average character of schools can scarcely be expected to rise above the requisition of the generality of parents; hence, a low estimate of parental responsibility will not only vitiate the early home education, but will extend its influence to the future training of the child at school, and tend to lower the standard of public education.

We must insist, then, that the education of children is the primary duty of their parents,—their proper duty and business according to the economy of nature, which is only another term for the ordinance of God;—and that whatever foreign assistance they may find it expedient or necessary to call in, they are responsible, through every stage of the process, for the training, intellectual and moral, which is imparted. Well would it be if adequate notions of parental responsibility were chargeable only upon the irreligious. They are but too prevalent among the professors of religion, and are the dry-rot of our churches. This is the day of institutions; but the most sacred of all institutions, the domestic, is too much overlooked or superseded. May we be allowed here to digress from our immediate subject so far as to bring under the consideration of our readers some striking remarks of John Howe upon this subject. ‘Consider God’s original, supreme, and sovereign interest in families, as he is the Founder of them, and as they are His plantation.’ ‘He sets the solitary in families.’ Psalm lxviii. 6. Consider this together with the ‘design of his forming of them; to wit, that He might have a ‘godly seed still arising from age to age. Mal. ii. 15. It was the ‘very end and design of that fundamental relation in families, ‘and unto families,—the conjugal relation. ‘Wherefore did he ‘make but one, when he had the residue of the Spirit? Why, ‘that he might seek a godly seed.’ As if it had been said, ‘These ‘plantations are mine. This, the constitution of families (in ‘which the conjugal relation is the fundamental relation) speaks ‘upon the first design of settling such a constitution as this. There ‘lay open (as we must be sure) to the foresight of the Divine ‘eye, what a general apostacy and defection there would be; and ‘that a corrupt nature would be transmitted from age to age,

‘from generation to generation. But God did determine with himself not therefore to abandon all to one common ruin: as if he should have said, ‘I will have an interest in this world notwithstanding.’ And therefore, as this was the original design of the constitution of families, that he might have a godly seed, though the apostacy has intervened, he will not quit his design and this we must understand him continually to insist upon as a sacred right to himself. . . . He will have all endeavours used for transmitting of religion, as well as corrupt and sinful nature is transmitted, from age to age; though the one is done by a natural, the other is done by instituted means, followed with a blessing, and by influence from above: he will have this latter design carried on by the mutual and joint endeavours of parents under the influence of his grace, as well as the former course is carried on unavoidably. But when no care or concern is had about this, the foundations of families are laid in a curse.’*

By whom can the *religious* education of children be efficiently conducted but by parents? If not commenced at home, how rarely can that fatal neglect be repaired at school! Where can the religious affections of a child be developed, and religion become the object of affection, but in the native sphere of a pious family? Where else can a Sunday be enjoyed?—that most important means of home education; at school, too often, a listless blank. Referring to the happy influence upon the intellectual faculties, of ‘a due and fervent attendance upon religious exercises, public and private,’ the present writer says:—

‘I am prepared to affirm, that, to the studious especially, and whether younger or older, *a Sunday well spent*,—spent in the happy exercises of the heart, devotional and domestic,—a Sunday given to the *soul*, is the best of all means of refreshment for the mere intellect. . . . If this be true, the general inference it suggests is easily applied to the business of education; and the recollection of it will have its weight with parents in cherishing the religious and social affections among their children. It is very certain that young persons may be shorn of their happiness, and may be chilled in their affections, and yet be made scholars, or mathematicians, or what else we please, in particular departments; but I deny that they can have the benefit of a vigorous development of the mind, as a whole, except in the sunshine of happiness, and love, and piety.’—pp. 77, 78.

We could dilate upon this subject; but it is necessary that we should proceed to give some account of the plan and contents of the present volume. The first chapter treats of the ‘points of comparison between Public and Private Education.’ The dis-

* Howe’s Works, (Bungay Ed.) p. 1247.

tinguishing recommendations of the latter are stated to be, 1st. 'That the stress of the process may be made to rest upon sentiment and principle, and the deep reciprocal affections of the teacher and the taught, instead of its falling upon law, and routine, and mechanism:' 2d. That both the method and matter may be exactly adapted to the capacity and taste of the pupil: 3rd. That it may be exempted from the despotism of irrational usage; and 4thly, That it may be conducted upon the principle of *retarded development*. This last advantage is principally insisted upon, the Author being strongly opposed to the prevalent system of favouring the expansion of the faculties at an early age.

'The principle of *delayed* development supposes a vigilant regard to be had to the spontaneous germination of the several faculties; and a due care also that the vitality of each should be preserved throughout the period during which its expansion and exercise are deferred. The rule we have to recommend enjoins that excitement should be postponed, while nutriment is supplied; and in a word, that the mental force should be husbanded, much rather than used.'—p. 14.

In plain words, education ought to observe and adhere to the order of nature in the development of the faculties; and the growth and expansion of the mind ought never to be *forced*. In the second chapter, the Author lays down the principle, that 'happiness is the necessary condition of home education.' This is a doctrine very much at variance with the prevalent notion, that the trials and childish adversities of school are beneficial as a preparation for the struggles of after life. From the fact, that the Author of our nature has made a special provision for securing the happiness of childhood, Mr. Taylor thinks, it is a just inference, that what the Creator in his beneficence so plainly intends, we are bound to promote;—that it is 'a religious duty to make the happiness of infancy and childhood our main care in whatever relates to early education.'

'The recollection of a thoroughly happy childhood (other advantages not wanting) is the very best preparation, moral and intellectual, with which to encounter the duties and cares of real life. A sunshine childhood is an auspicious inheritance with which, as a fund, to commence trading in practical wisdom and active goodness. It is a great thing only to have known by experience, that tranquil, temperate, felicity is actually attainable on earth. How many have pursued a reckless course, because—or chiefly because—they early learned to think of *happiness* as a chimera, and believed momentary gratifications to be the only substitute placed within the reach of man. Practicable happiness is much oftener wantonly thrown away, than really snatched from us: but it is the most likely to be pursued, overtaken, and husbanded by those who already, and through some considerable portion

of their lives, have been happy. To have known nothing but misery, is the most portentous condition under which human nature can pursue its course.

‘Due care being taken to elicit the benevolent sensibilities, it is the happiest children who (natural dispositions allowed for) will be the most sympathetic, and the most ready to forego personal gratifications for the relief of the wants of others. The substantial principles, or habits of feeling, whence, in after life, a course of self-denying beneficence should take its rise, are best bottomed upon the personal experience of much felicity. If angels are more benevolent than men, it is, we may believe, because they are themselves conversant with the highest happiness. Continued gloom and depression during childhood and youth, debilitate as well the body as the mind; and whatever enfeebles the constitution, vitiates it. Under the irritation or the melancholy that attend harsh treatment and a want of natural enjoyments, the animal secretions receive a poison which breaks out in the temper, and constitutes at length malignant character. It is in the sunshine literally, and the sunshine metaphorically, that the human body and mind reach their blooming perfection.’—pp. 39, 40.

Chapter III. treats of ‘Family Love and Order,’ as both essential and ‘absolutely inseparable in relation to the domestic system.’ These three chapters may be considered as preliminary. In the fourth and following two chapters, the Author proceeds to distinguish the three stages of development to which education applies; *infancy*, terminating with the sixth year; *childhood*, ordinarily extending to the eleventh or twelfth; and *youth*, to the seventeenth.

Infancy being the period during which the *animal* organization of the mind is advancing most rapidly, every thing should be made subservient, during that period, to the healthy growth and consolidation of the brain. It does not fall within the Author’s plan, to treat specifically of the *moral* culture. We agree with him, that ‘very little *book-learning* ought to be attempted during this stage;’—that an infant or young child ought to be read to, rather than allowed to read much; and better still, conversed with; and that all is accomplished that ought to be attempted, ‘if *mental vivacity* be maintained.’ But during this early stage, the foundations of the moral culture must be laid in the discipline of the infant *will*, the quickening of the conscience, and the wakening of the heart to the emotions of piety. These initial processes of moral education cannot be commenced too early; and if the season of infancy is suffered to elapse before they are accomplished, the time can scarcely ever be redeemed. The question cannot too soon be settled, which is to govern, the will of the child or the authority of the parent. If the will of the infant is *broken in* by mild, judicious firmness on the part of the mother, sustained, when necessary, by the authority of the father,

the instinct of obedience may become so habitual and pleasurable, as to preclude all occasion for having recourse to severity of discipline at a later period, when punishment is apt to degrade and vitiate the mind which it is employed to subdue. A sense of accountableness is instinctive alike in infants and in the domestic animals; but, in both, so far as it is mere instinct, it respects, as its object, only the authority of the immediate superior—the nurse or the master, whose eye is feared, but may be evaded; and this *animal* conscience, although a means of government in reference to conduct, has in it nothing of moral character. But, with the first idea of the Creator, the Omnipresent and All-seeing, the sense of accountableness *to God*, which is the *moral* conscience, is indissolubly connected; and we say that it is during infancy, that the conscience may be, and must be, quickened into a determined and vital principle or faculty of the moral being. And as the will and the conscience admit of being so far brought under education at the earliest period of conscious existence, so do the affections; and not only towards those who are seen, but also towards Him who is unseen. Faith, or the spiritual principle, whether considered as instrumentally produced by human teaching, or as efficiently generated by Divine influence in connexion with the subject matter of religious instruction,—is found to be in fact more readily and more certainly the result of early education, than of any after process of moral culture. We dare not say that faith in God is strictly natural to the infant:—‘that which is born of the flesh is flesh.’ But, as there is less in the heart of the infant to resist Divine influence, than in those who have been suffered to grow up habitually callous to religious impressions, we may be allowed to say, that the natural and proper influence of religious truth, so far as the intellect can receive it, is more likely to manifest itself in the regeneration of the child than in the conversion of the adult. Infant piety is neither a forced production, nor a phenomenon. Baptismal regeneration is a monstrous and pernicious fiction; but infant regeneration may be considered as the natural result of the regenerative efficacy of religious training at the earliest stage of intellectual development.

But, if the spiritual principle should not be thought capable of being quickened into vitality in the heart of an infant, at least let it be an object of parental solicitude, that, during the first years of life, no *obstruction* should be created to its development in early childhood, when both the intellectual and the moral culture must be directed more systematically to the training of the rational nature. Not to pursue this view of the subject any further, we shall transcribe the Author’s remarks upon the phenomena which sometimes attend the transition from childhood to youth.

‘The tenth and eleventh years are, I think, the times when internal revolutions often take place as well in the dispositions as in the intellectual conformation. By *internal* changes, I mean such as seem to arise from occult causes, probably of a physical kind, and which are to be distinguished from modifications of the character plainly attributable to certain external influences. These changes, as affecting the moral condition, demand often the nicest regard, and the most skilful treatment, on the part of parents: but, to speak of such as belong to our present subject, it is about this time, if ever, that remarkable faculties, and the rare endowments which constitute genius, if they have been latent during infancy and early childhood, begin to make themselves perceptible. That which shows no bursting bud in the twelfth year, probably will never be found to belong to the mind at all.

‘It is about this time, therefore, that, with little hazard, parents may so far calculate the future course of their sons, as is requisite for determining the sort of education they are to receive. Not that the particular calling or profession need be, or can be, fixed upon; but it may then pretty well be known, whether a boy is to follow the common gainful occupations of an ordinary course, or is to devote himself to some one of the intellectual professions. This forecast of the future course regulates every thing in the quality and quantity of instruction to be imparted.

‘Again: the middle, as distinguished from the earlier, or even the later periods of childhood, is not unfrequently marked by a sort of thoughtfulness, or pensive tendency to muse on the conditions of human life. It is as if the mind, in just reaching the first hillock on its journey, were halting a moment to ponder the landscape before it. The infant does not reflect in any such manner; and as to the youth of fourteen, the ripened vigour of the animal system, the higher energy and wider range of the desires, and the greater pressure and variety of all sorts of engagements, dissipate effectively the meditative humour; and in truth, vulgarize the mind, and impel it to accept whatever it finds suited to its tastes, without inquiry.’—pp. 154, 155.

There is something fanciful in the Author’s notion, that ‘it seems as if each marked era of human life were preceded by a ‘season of thoughtfulness;’ but persons who have watched the unfolding of the mind and character in children, will be at no loss to recollect *instances* similar to those which have suggested his remarks. In the following observations, Mr. Taylor appears to *hold* the scales, rather than to ‘strike a balance,’ between the two methods of education.

‘The practical difference between a public and a private education becomes broadly apparent about the time when boyhood succeeds to childhood. In their eleventh or twelfth year, children who have been reared beneath the paternal roof, and who have lived in the society of well-informed adults, are found to be very unlike, in tastes and habits, those of the same standing who have already passed several years at school. They will be *less childish, and more child-like*: they will, in

a sense, be too *adult*, and too *infantile*: there is an advantage they will possess, and a disadvantage also; and we must be prepared at once to avail ourselves to the utmost of the former, and to find means for obviating, as far as possible, the latter.

‘I do not profess to strike the balance between the two methods; but, simply keeping my eye fixed upon that which I have adopted, and which I undertake to treat of, shall labour to point out the means of doing the best with it.

‘Home education, when it reaches its later stages, is not unlikely to present an apparent, and perhaps to some extent a real inconsistency with the leading principle professed in this volume;—I mean that of a retarded development of the mind; for it may often be found that intelligent children, who are constantly the companions of well-informed parents, and who may have been their father’s assistants in literary or scientific pursuits, have become, notwithstanding his intentions to the contrary, far more mature in tastes and habits than they would have been if they had passed the same years at school. If, however, the home system be in all respects judiciously conducted,—if animal health and hilarity are maintained by the proper means,—and if severe exactions in the course of study are scrupulously avoided,—few, if any, of the ill consequences of this early ripening of the mind will have been incurred. Yet I will not say that a father may not sometimes wish to see his sons a little more *boyish* than they probably will be, if they have conversed much more with him than with their peers.

‘*The school-boy of fourteen is what his comrades have made him; but the home-bred boy is what his parents have made him*; and there is a balance of advantages between the two kinds of character. The former is the creature of vehement and instantaneous impulses, and he acts under the guidance, not of the individual, but of the conventional reason. Whatever may be his acquirements, and whatever the assumed manliness of his bearing, he is the *child* still, and is more sensual, and more frivolous, and more wilful than a home-bred boy five years younger than himself. In relation, however, to the engagements of common life, he is not ill prepared to brunt the world as it is. He is not too thoughtful, or too wise, or too nice in his tastes, or too considerate of the feelings of others, to take up the rough work of professional or commercial life; and he is saved not a little of the torture which those must pass through, who enter upon the broad paths of business with their own individual sense of right and wrong, and their own feelings all about them.’—pp. 159—161.

Leaving our readers to draw their own conclusion, we hasten to complete our analysis of the contents of the volume. Chapter VII. illustrates ‘some diversities of mental conformation considered in relation to methods of culture.’ Chapter VIII. contains ‘a practical analysis of the intellectual faculties, with a ‘view to the culture of each.’ The culture of ‘the conceptive faculty’ is the subject of the next two chapters; that of the

perception of Resemblance and Analogy is then treated of; and finally, in Chapter XII., the expansion of the abstractive and reasoning faculties. As, in this part of the work, the explanation of what our Author deems the method most consonant with the philosophical principles which he lays down, necessarily runs into details, and we have no room for entering into minute discussion, we shall content ourselves with expressing our cordial approbation of his general views, without pledging ourselves to an agreement with him in every particular. Those persons whose duties require them to be more immediately occupied with the business of education, will be grateful for the hints he has thrown out; and the main features of his plan will recommend themselves to the good sense of all intelligent readers; being founded on the importance of bestowing a well-considered culture upon the several faculties of the mind in the order of their natural development. In the present volume, he has professedly 'gone no further than to open the subject of a systematic culture of the mind, 'by suggesting some method for eliciting and for enriching those 'faculties that are passive and recipient chiefly, and which, as they 'are developed early, demand the teacher's attention before the 'time when any strenuous labours ought to be exacted from 'children.' The subject of Moral and Religious culture is deferred, as we gather from the Preface, for separate consideration.

Art. III. *England and Wales, from Drawings of J. M. W. Turner, Esq. R.A. With Descriptive and Historic Illustrations.* By H. E. LLOYD, Esq. Royal 4to. Each No. four plates. Twenty-three Nos. published. Longman and Co.

ELEVEN years have passed away since the appearance of the first Number of this work, accompanied by a notice, that a number would be 'published punctually at intervals of three 'months.'

Within so long a period, not a few of the original subscribers must have finally closed their accounts, with artists, publishers, and the world itself; leaving the unfinished series to the chances of the taste and means of their descendants, for going on with it to its completion in some perhaps distant year. Others, who could discern all the finer workmanship of the prints in the first number with the unassisted eye, will have been reduced to seek the aid of glasses to do justice to those in the latest; and may be beginning to apprehend that even that will be a defective help for such inspection, by the time the work shall reach its conclusion,

should they live so long. No probable term for such an event is assigned; there is no assurance of greater despatch; nor are we aware to what length the series is projected to be drawn out. The circumstance that fifteen parts are made to constitute a first volume, affords a conjecture that an equal number may be intended for the second. *Subjects* would not be wanting for an indefinitely longer course of graphic illustration. But the possessors of such elegant articles are apt to feel a particular and somewhat impatient interest to have them in a state of completeness, even, on the condition of foregoing a sequel of equal beauty, that might be made by a prolonged allowance of time. The idea of *completeness* has, though not distinctly reflected on, considerable power over the imagination. It is gratifying to have the loose and confused treasures adjusted, compacted, and consolidated into *one thing*; with appropriate grace of exterior; in a shape fitted to facility of inspection by themselves or their admiring friends.

This extreme slowness of publication, therefore, is an error on the score of policy; is it attributable to necessity? Has the admired draughtsman become too opulent by his art to be disposed to work, except when the fancy happens to come on him? Or does he (such a whisper has been heard), exact too high a premium? Or have the excellent engravers too many things in their hands at once? Or is it, that the undertaking is too little favoured by the public to stimulate and reward a more expeditious progress?

Of the taste and discernment of that public, in this department of fine art, the work may certainly claim to be a test; for it is one of the very foremost, if we should not rather say, the one foremost, of its class. It has two advantages over that eminently fine preceding work of the southern coast, also, after Turner's drawings—a less uniformity of subjects, and a greater variety of able engravers. We have the diversified characters of execution of a considerable number of our first-rate workmen. And if national pride be the virtue for which every nation applauds it in its own behalf, we may well indulge it on a comparison of our engravers with any others in the world. Let any one compare these plates with, for example, those of the same class in the imperial *Musée Français*, or later and better single prints from the continent. It hardly needs a practised eye, still less, that of an artist, to perceive the striking superiority. The solidity, prominence, and natural surface of the nearer masses and substances in the view, worked in a graceful irregularity and combination of lines, instead of being shaped as if of bare straight iron wires (we describe without any pretension to technical skill and language); the delicious softness, the slight shadiness without loss of distinctness, in the receding parts; the natural truth of water, in all its

states, from that of a tranquil mirror to the most violent agitation; the seizing of the visionary caprices of cloud-scenery, leaving it as if still floating and changing—such things as these may furnish for foreign artists a school, in which they will soon rival their masters.

The plates, in the present work, are on a much larger than the usual scale for quarto publications, and all in the line manner. Respecting this richest mode of engraving, there have recently been made, with perfect truth unfortunately, representations of the extreme deficiency even among the cultivated classes, of qualification to appreciate its superior excellence, and the talents required in the artist; or to take any account of his immense labour, and of what would be an adequate reward. As to the taste, invention, and varied contrivances of adaptation, there can of course be generally no notion at all. And as to the mere manual labour, though, any one who looks attentively at a print of moderate size must know, that so many tens of thousands of cuts and touches, considerately and deliberately made, must bind down the operator to the most fixed attention through very long spaces of time, it is little imagined that whole years may be consumed on one plate. The unknowing casual inspector, first wondering at what he thinks the extravagant price put on a single impression, is next amazed if he hear it said, that many hundreds, or if the piece be very large, perhaps, several thousands of pounds, were paid for figuring three or four square feet of copper. He exclaims at the exorbitancy of the artist; and says, *he* will not, by being a purchaser, contribute to encourage any such monstrous exactions. And he is quite incredulous, when further told, that the sums in question are a very inadequate reward for the talents, the industry, and the wasted health, of an ingenious man, whose excellence in the work has not been attained but through many years of assiduous study and practice, as a painful education of his fine native talent, of his eye, and of his hand.

We know no help for it, unless some of the wealth now lavished on grosser luxuries and ostentatious show, shall, one of these days, chance to fall under the command, and be converted to the indulgence of an intellectual and refined taste.

But there is an untoward circumstance in the nature of the material chiefly used hitherto as the basis of the work. If a copper-plate can render, but considerably less, than a thousand good impressions, and an improving taste and discernment in the patronizing public, shall reject as valueless all the deteriorated ones, there cannot be that enlarged circulation which we are supposing as the means of a more adequate reward to the artist. The resource must be a more general employment of steel. This, we understand is adopted for the forthcoming Royal Gallery of British Arts; which sends before it the promise of first-rate

excellence at a more moderate price than that of any rival exhibition. In consequence of the almost endless labour, so indifferently remunerated, the line engraving, on any considerable scale, is in danger of being supplanted by mezzotint and lithography. It is so, in a great degree, in France.

But to return from this digression to the work before us. The series of nearly a hundred plates, already produced, may apprise lovers of the picturesque that all manner of interesting scenery, short of giant Alps and cataracts, may be found without quitting the island. We have here exhibited mountains, vales, gorges, torrents, gloomy recesses, vistas, ruined castles, solitary wilds, wide horizons, scenes of bustle, inland cities, seaports, marine prospects; with all the advantages of the point of view, characteristic accessories, calm and storm, sunshine and moonshine, that the genius of Turner could give them. Sometimes he revels in those violent *effects* in which he so much excels, and they say, exaggerates. Exaggeration or not, we avow that we are delighted at the horrid grandeur into which he sometimes blackens his skies, rends them with thunder, and throws a lurid gloom on the scene beneath; a spectacle analogous to tragedy in the moral world, to the contemplation of which who does not eagerly turn from a prolonged detention on the view of a tranquil, unexciting, though, perhaps, agreeable, order of things? But he is not, like another eminent painter, in a department partaking of landscape (imaginary landscape indeed) almost constantly embattling the elements of darkness and tempest. He introduces all the homely realities belonging to any of his subjects. There are rustics, fishermen, sailors, cottages, crowded market-places, amusements, labours, utensils, and accommodations of ordinary life. If the original drawings had any of the wanton perversities of colouring latterly charged on Turner's pencil, they could, of course, but little affect the engravings.

His list of engravers includes a majority of those who are carrying the art, in landscape, to a pitch of excellence, which we cannot conceive it possible to surpass, Goodall, Wallis, Miller, Willmore, Brandard, and a number of others worthy of the fraternity and the rivalry in a band of artists, whose associated and whose separate performances will be the admiration of a distant age, and in distant regions of the globe. It were invidious to make comparisons. They have all acquitted themselves meritoriously; many of them in other works, as well as this. We only take the liberty of suggesting to one of them a modification of the manner of representing water impelled by storm. Let the example be the plate, 'Long Ship's Light-House,' in No. 20; where we think it will be seen that the delineation is much too hard for imitation of any action of a fluid. It stands out in dry springy lines, some as if forced down with difficulty to drive on a level;

others darting up in sharp distinct points and ridges, and sheaves, instead of bursting into spray. It is an effect that suggests the idea of something different from a simply passive commotion of the water; and as if it had under the assault of the blast a certain rebellious force of its own. It somewhat reminds us of representations we have seen of the rank stout rushes and flags of a jungle, in tumult and *re-action* under an impetuous wind.

In so large a number of views, there would be more difficulty than use in singling out any that we might fancy more specially attractive, at once by the character of the subjects and the beauty of the representation. In making a slight trial to do so, we soon found that the selection must be nearly at hazard, among a multitude of competitors of equal or nearly equal claims. The eye is sure of its gratification, open wherever we may.

After all, it may be questionable, how far we should congratulate the possessors of such a work, except those of them who possess, also, that rare combination of advantages, health, patient vigour, liberty, and money—the last not least. As to some of the others, our own experience would not assure us, that the pleasure of looking round this gallery, representative of spectacles which its very production implies, it would be gratifying to see in their reality, may not be partly counterveiled by the reflection, how much there is of what is beautiful, striking, and romantic, within a few hundred miles of them, which they must never behold.

The neatly *written* portion of the work, by Mr. Lloyd, giving a brief account of the subject of each plate, is of good service as far as it goes. But is it become a law of fashion, or artistical etiquette, that the description of the place or object depicted, however remarkable for local features or historical associations, shall seldom exceed the amount of about a quarto page in large type! Would it have a vulgar look, too much like a leaf of a gazetteer, if both the pages, to the full breadth of the press, were discoloured with lines, and of somewhat smaller print? Is the blank left in compliment to the inspector's imagination? The following account of Stone-Henge accompanying one of Turner's conjurations of storm and thunder, is of considerably more than the average quantity.

‘This very remarkable, and on the whole, unique monument of British antiquity, has been the subject of so much antiquarian research and learned discussion, that it would far exceed our limits even briefly to notice the variety of opinions, theories, and suppositions which have been published, concerning its origin and purpose. It consists of a great collection of stones of an immense size, which from their positions appear to have formed one great building. Their present appearance is that of a complete ruin, a confused heap of standing and fallen stones; but by attentively considering their relative situations, the shape and dimensions of the original structure may still be traced. The most probable opinion is, that it was originally intended for a Druidical

temple ; but its founders, the date of its erection, and the means by which these enormous masses of stone were brought to this desolate spot, and raised to their respective situations, are circumstances all which are buried in obscurity. The whole building appears to have consisted of two circular and two elliptical ranges of upright stones, with horizontal stones lying on the outer circle, in a continued order all round ; and five imposts, or horizontal stones, on ten uprights of the third row. The whole is surrounded by a ditch and vallum of earth ; connected with which are three other stones ; the vallum does not exceed fifteen feet in height, and is interior to the ditch. The diameter of the whole area within the vallum is about three hundred feet. The ditch is three hundred and sixty-nine yards in circumference, and about fifteen feet in the slope on the scarp side. The entrance through this line of circumvallation is on the N. E., and is marked by a bank and ditch called the avenue. The total number of the stones which composed Stone-Henge in its complete state, seems to have been one-hundred and nine ; namely, thirty in the outer circle, forty in the inner circle, fifteen in the first ellipsis, and nineteen in the second. The remaining five are, one in the centre of the whole, called the altarstone, fifteen feet in length ; one immense rude stone in the avenue, now in a leaning position, and sixteen feet in height, called the *Friar's-Heel* ; and three others within the vallum, one of which, exactly one hundred feet from the 'Friar's Heel,' and the same distance from the outermost circle, is twenty-two feet two inches in length. Seventeen stones of the outer circle are still standing ; but there are only six imposts, each of which has two mortices, to correspond with two tenons on the tops of the vertical stones. The uprights are from thirteen to fifteen feet in height, and eighteen in circumference. Of the second circle, eight feet three inches within the other, and consisting of smaller and more irregular stones, only eight are now standing. The grandest part of Stone-Henge is the outermost ellipse, consisting of five separate pairs of trilithons, or two large upright stones with a third on the top as an impost. These stones are more regular in their shapes, and more carefully formed, than those of the outer circle. The interior oval consisted of nineteen upright stones without imposts. At a distance, this extraordinary monument appears a trifling object, its bulk and character being lost in the vastness of the plain by which it is surrounded ; and, even, on a nearer approach it often disappoints the expectations of strangers, who visit it with preconceived and exaggerated ideas. But its vast extent, its peculiar character, quite distinct from the temples of upright stones found in various parts of the British islands, and other countries of Europe, and, even, on the Asiatic coast of the Black Sea, justly entitle it to be considered as one of the wonders of antiquity.'

Reverting to the languid progress of this work, the total uncertainty as to the length of the intervals in the remaining course of publication, and the extent to which it may be expected to be prolonged, we would suggest, whether the publishers would not do well to afford some precise information, conveyed in the publisher's circular, or other channel of public notices.

Art. IV. *The Life of William Wilberforce.* By his Sons ROBERT ISAAC WILBERFORCE, M.A., Vicar of East Farleigh, and SAMUEL WILBERFORCE, M.A., Rector of Brightstone. In 5 vols. Murray: London, 1838.

THE appearance of these volumes will be hailed by a large class of readers. They are happily appropriate to the times, and can scarcely fail to exercise a salutary influence over the tone and direction of public feeling. Mr. Wilberforce was, in many respects, an extraordinary man. He was made up of generous impulses, happily controlled, and guided by a nicely balanced judgment. His natural endowments were rich and varied, while the unsophisticated kindness of his heart, gave him a high place in the esteem and love of all who knew him. His biography, therefore, must necessarily present many points of interest, and we shall best fulfil our duty as journalists, by devoting as large a portion of our pages as is practicable, to the details of his instructive and eventful life. The lessons which that life embodied, are of the last importance to his countrymen; and cannot be duly appreciated without an intimate knowledge of his history.

Mr. Wilberforce was born at Hull, on the 24th of August, 1759. His father, a man in opulent circumstances, was a merchant in that town, and his ancestors had long been resident in the surrounding county. His constitution was feeble, and his stature short, and considerable fears were entertained for his life during some years. He himself acknowledged it as one of the mercies for which it became him to be grateful, that he 'was not born in less civilized times, when it would have been thought impossible to rear so delicate a child.' Little is known of his childhood, save that his disposition was eminently affectionate, and his elocution remarkable. At seven years of age he was sent to the grammar-school of his native town, where Isaac Milner, afterwards dean of Carlisle, tells us, 'we used to set him upon a table, and make him read aloud as an example to the other boys.' The future senator was thus preparing for those effective bursts of eloquence, which ultimately succeeded in forcing the claims of humanity on the reluctant attention of a torpid, selfish, and ill-informed parliament. His father died before young Wilberforce had completed his ninth year, and he was, in consequence, transferred to the care of a paternal uncle, residing in the neighbourhood of London. The school where he was placed, though equal to most of that day, was far from being of a high order. The following sketch of it is supplied by Mr. Wilberforce in one of his private papers, and is any thing but creditable to its domestic economy and literary pretensions. Mr. Chalmers, the

‘master, himself a Scotchman, had an usher of the same nation, whose red beard—for he scarcely shaved once a month—I shall never forget.’ They taught writing, French, arithmetic, and Latin; with Greek we did not much meddle. It was frequented chiefly by the sons of merchants, and they taught, therefore, every thing and nothing. Here I continued some time as a par-lour boarder: I was sent, at first, amongst the lodgers, and I can remember, even now, the nauseous food with which we were supplied, and which I could not eat without sickness.’ His aunt with whom he now resided at Wimbledon, was an excellent woman, deeply imbued with a religious spirit, and warmly attached to the ministry of Whitefield. Young Wilberforce was, in consequence, brought into association with a new class of influences. He saw religion in a different form from that under which it had been exhibited to him at Hull, and he yielded himself to its solemn and vital convictions. His mother, whom he describes as ‘an Archbishop Tillotson’s Christian,’ was alarmed at the religious tendencies of his mind, and repaired to London, for the purpose of removing him from his uncle’s family. ‘I deeply felt the parting,’ he said, when recurring in future life to this circumstance, ‘for I loved them as parents: indeed, I was almost broken-hearted at the separation.’

There can be little doubt, that his residence at Wimbledon was mainly conducive to the formation of those religious views which gave so decided a complexion to his future life. His first impressions, indeed, were obliterated amid the gaiety to which his friends introduced him on his return to Hull. He lost the solemn convictions of his childhood, and became thoughtless and ambitious like others; but the seed of the kingdom, though latent for a time, sprung up in happy season and bore much fruit. His irreligious relatives rejoiced in the change, and did their utmost to promote it, and their object was greatly facilitated by the social habits then prevalent at Hull. ‘The religious impressions which I had gained at Wimbledon,’ he himself records, ‘continued for a considerable time after my return to Hull, but my friends spared no pains to stifle them. I might almost say, that no pious parent ever laboured more to impress a beloved child with sentiments of piety than they did to give me a taste for the world and its diversions.’

It would be useless to speculate on the probable consequences of his having remained longer under his uncle’s roof. There is no saying, what changes might, in that case, have been wrought,—how different a complexion might have been given to the whole of his life,—how altered might have been his moral position, his alliances and political views. The churchman, would, probably, have become a Dissenter; and the friend of Pitt, the political opponent of Fox, have been known in St. Stephen’s

as the consistent advocate of liberal politics and the rights of conscience. He himself, at the age of thirty-eight, when his churchmanship was rife and his views of Dissenters were far from being so candid as they became subsequently, has remarked, 'If I had staid with my uncle, I should probably have been a bigoted, despised Methodist.' Soon after his return to Hull, he was placed at the endowed grammar-school of Pocklington, where he remained till his removal to Cambridge, October 1776. An interesting anecdote is recorded of him during this period, by a surviving school-fellow. Amid the thoughtlessness of his boyhood, and the self-indulgence to which the mistaken kindness of friends invited him, a remarkable indication was given of his future course. It is interesting as marking the early development of his ruling passion, and shows the happy harmony there must have been between his sympathies and convictions. A youth of fourteen must have had a generous heart, as well as a clear and manly intellect, to have addressed a letter to the editor of the York paper in condemnation of the African slave trade, then connived at by all classes, and pouring its ill-gotten wealth into the bosoms of a thousand families.

A removal to Cambridge at the age of seventeen,—'the master of an independent fortune under a mother's sole guardianship,'—would have proved fatal to most youths. The habits then prevalent in the University were eminently pernicious, and must have constituted his college life a scene of great temptation. 'I was introduced,' he says, 'on the very first night of my arrival, to as licentious a set of men as can well be conceived. They drank hard, and their conversation was even worse than their lives. I lived amongst them for some time, though I never relished their society, . . . often, indeed, I was horror-struck at their conduct. . . . and after the first year, I shook off in a great measure my connexion with them.' Dissenters as we are, we can well appreciate the literary advantages attendant on a college life: yet if those advantages are to be purchased at so costly a price, we infinitely prefer that our youths should forego them. It is too much to expect that they should pass through such a process uninjured,—that they should come forth from such an ordeal with virtuous habits and unimpaired convictions of the importance of religion. In some rare instances this may be the case, but their infrequent occurrence, and obvious contrast to the general result, present a lamentable view of the social working of a university life. In Mr. Wilberforce's time the whole system was corrupt and enfeebling. The gownsmen freely indulged in the vices of the day, while the fellows and tutors conspired to foment the pride and indolence of every man of fortune. 'Their object,' he remarks, 'seemed to be, to make and keep me idle. If ever I appeared studious, they would say to me, 'why in the

'world should a man of your fortune trouble himself with fagging?' Whilst my companions were reading hard and attending lectures, card parties and idle amusements, consumed my time. The tutors would often say within my hearing, that '*they* were mere saps, but that I did all by talent.' We trust that things are somewhat better now, though we have our misgivings. The spirit of reform has forced an entrance, but as yet its advocates are few and feeble. It is some consolation, under the indignity and wrong of an exclusion from these national institutions, to know that our youths are exempted from the moral poison which pervades them, and which has served in ten thousand instances to deprave the hearts and to destroy the fine promise of others. The hopes of many families have been withered, the hearts of many parents saddened for life, by the reckless and licentious habits which have sprung from a college life. And, yet, these institutions are to be regarded as the nurseries of religion,—the school where piety and talent are consecrated to the public weal, or to the still higher duties of religion. It may answer the purpose of party writers, so to represent them, but we point in refutation of the statement to the disclosures made in the biography of such men as Mr. Wilberforce. Facts are stubborn things, and will tell on the public mind, when the most plausible theories are forgotten or despised. Let the tone of public sentiment be raised; let parents become duly solicitous for the moral training of their sons, and Oxford and Cambridge must be made different from what they are, or their halls will be deserted.

Mr. Wilberforce having resolved to enter on public life, offered himself as a candidate for the representation of Hull, at the general election, in 1780. The constituency of his native town sustained at that period much the same character as at present. Two guineas were given for the single vote of a resident freeman, and four for a plumper, while the expenses of those brought down from London averaged about ten pounds each. Mr. Wilberforce conformed to the custom of the place, and was returned by a large majority, having spent between eight and nine thousand pounds. He, subsequently, regretted having done so, declaring, that rather than so enter parliament again, he would prefer remaining a private man for life. His success, on this occasion, constituted a favorable introduction to London society. He was, at once, elected a member of the leading clubs, was on terms of warm friendship with William Pitt, and associated in easy familiarity with Fox and Sheridan, and other noted political men. The manner in which he was weaned from gambling, was highly characteristic, and gave promise of something better than had yet been realized.

'It was by this vice,' say his biographers, 'that he was himself most nearly ensnared. A brief diary of this period records more than once the loss of

£100 at the Faro table. He was weaned from it in a most characteristic manner. 'We can have no play to-night,' complained some of the party at the club, 'for St. Andrew is not here to keep the bank.' 'Wilberforce,' said Mr. Banks (who never joined himself,) 'if you will keep it I will give you a guinea.' The playful challenge was accepted, but as the game grew deep, he rose the winner of £600. Much of this was lost by those who were only heirs to future fortunes, and could not therefore meet such a call without inconvenience. The pain he felt at their annoyance cured him of a taste which seemed but too likely to become predominant.—Vol. I., p. 18.

His subsequent election for Yorkshire, in opposition to the powerful Whig aristocracy of that county, greatly increased his political celebrity. Pitt having displaced the coalition ministry of Lord North and Mr. Fox, had, for some time, been struggling with an adverse majority in the commons, and was now permitted by George the Third to appeal from that majority to the nation. The result answered his most sanguine expectations, and completely established his ascendancy. Mr. Wilberforce was warmly attached to the minister, and rejoicing in his success lent him a zealous and disinterested support.

They were on terms of the closest intimacy, and much of their leisure time was spent together. Most of the readers of these volumes will be surprised at the light thrown on the social character of this extraordinary man. His general carriage was cold, reserved, and haughty,—a fit emblem of the system on which, with such fatal energy, he ruled the country. Yet, it would appear, there were elements of mirth and joyousness in his constitution which occasionally showed themselves in all the playful moods of childhood. He was a frequent visitor at Wimbledon where Mr. Wilberforce now resided, and the following account is given of his social unbendings.

'Little was it known, by those who saw him only in his public course, that the stiffness of Mr. Pitt's ordinary manner could thus at times unbend, and wanton in these exuberant bursts of natural vivacity. The sports of the rigid Scipio and meditative Lælius in their ungirded hours were equalled by the 'foinings,' of the garden at Wimbledon, where Pitt's overflowing spirits carried him to every height of jest. 'We found one morning the fruits of Pitt's earlier rising in the careful sowing of the garden beds with the fragments of a dress hat, in which 'Ryder had overnight come down from the opera.' It was in this varied and familiar intercourse that their mutual affection was matured; an affection which Mr. Wilberforce retained through life in spite of difference in politics and on yet more important subjects, and the remembrance of which would often cast a momentary sadness over the habitual cheerfulness of his aged countenance.'—ib., p. 28.

The time was now come when an important change was to be effected in Mr. Wilberforce's character and views, and the cir-

circumstances by which it was brought about are highly characteristic of the inscrutable ways of divine providence. Hitherto, he had been the mere man of the world, ambitious but well-disposed, with much kindness of heart, a deep sympathy with all that was human, but no reference to a higher code than was prevalent in the circle where he ordinarily moved. His early impressions had wholly disappeared; the promise of his spring had been blighted; and the rank growth of subsequent years afforded no ground to hope for the harvest yet to be gathered. But there was an agency at work which he did not recognize, and the time of its development was drawing near. Upon the prorogation of parliament in 1784, he determined on a continental tour, and applied to a friend at York to accompany him. To his great surprise the invitation was declined, and meeting shortly afterwards with Isaac Milner the offer was transferred to him, and accepted. The whole affair, apparently so casual, would be passed over as one of the trifling occurrences of a busy and crowded life, were it not for the consequences which followed. Milner was no ordinary man. He united great strength of intellect with equal kindness of heart, was free from the artificial refinements of polite society, and had imbibed a theological creed much more evangelical than was generally prevalent. Yet he was far, at this time, from being a spiritual man. Religion was his profession, and he had studied its doctrines as such, but his heart was uninfluenced by its spirit. His creed was correct, but his conduct was worldly. He was one of those instances, not infrequent at the present day, though then extremely rare, of evangelical sentiments dissociated from practical godliness. 'He was free,' says Mr. Wilberforce, 'from every taint of vice, but not more attentive than others to religion; he appeared, in all respects, like an ordinary man of the world, mixing like myself in all companies, and joining as readily as others in the prevalent Sunday parties.' His companion was wholly ignorant of the fact that his views differed from those of the clergy generally, and was first apprised of it, by his defence of a clergyman, of whom Mr. Wilberforce had spoken 'as a good man, but one who carried things too far.' 'Not a bit too far,' replied the future dean of Carlisle, and to this opinion he adhered when the conversation was subsequently renewed. In the course of their journey, frequent reference was made to religious topics, and Mr. Wilberforce, occasionally, treated them with lightness and raillery. This was rebuked by his graver companion, who would sometimes remark, 'I am no match for you, Wilberforce, in this running fire; but if you really wish to discuss these subjects seriously, I will gladly enter on them with you.' A copy of Doddridge's 'Rise and Progress of Religion,' was possessed by one of the party, and having been casually taken up by Mr. Wilberforce, the opinion of his friend was,

asked respecting it. 'It is one of the best books ever written,' said Milner, 'let us take it with us and read it on our journey.' His advice was followed, and Mr. Wilberforce determined, at some future period, to examine the Scriptures for himself, in order to ascertain if they coincided with the representations of the nonconformist author. This was done during the following year in company with Milner, when they journeyed from Genoa to Switzerland. Their conversation now became more impressive and absorbing; the Greek Testament was their daily companion, and its doctrines the subjects of thoughtful study. The result was a deep impression on Mr. Wilberforce of the reality of religion, and the correctness of the views which Milner defended.

'By degrees,' he says, 'I imbibed his sentiments, though I must confess with shame, that they long remained merely as opinions assented to by my understanding, but not influencing my heart. My interest in them certainly increased, and, at length, I began to be impressed with a sense of their importance. Milner, though full of levity on all other subjects, never spoke on this but with the utmost seriousness, and all he said tended to increase my attention to religion.

'Often, while in the full enjoyment of all that this world could bestow, my conscience told me, that in the true sense of the word, I was not a Christian. I laughed, I sang, I was apparently gay and happy, but the thought would steal across me, 'What madness is all this; to continue easy in a state in which a sudden call out of the world would consign me to everlasting misery, and that when eternal happiness is within my grasp!' For I had received into my understanding the great truths of the gospel, and believed that its offers were free and universal; and that God had promised to give his Holy Spirit to them that asked for it. At length, such thoughts as these completely occupied my mind, and I began to pray earnestly.' 'Began three or four days ago,' he says, Oct. 25th, 'to get up very early. In the solitude and self-conversation of the morning had thoughts, which I trust will come to something.'—'As soon as I reflected seriously upon these subjects, the deep guilt and black ingratitude of my past life forced itself upon me in the strongest colours, and I condemned myself for having wasted my precious time, and opportunities, and talents.'—*ib.*, pp. 87, 88.

Such was the process through which he was led to the more serious consideration of religious truth. As yet little progress was made, but he had entered on the course which was destined to effect a thorough revolution in his views and conduct. It may accord with a shallow and pretending philosophy to decry the reality of conversion and the agency of the Deity in its production, but the less prejudiced inquirer after truth will be staggered by such facts as are here presented. A marked change was wrought in the sentiments, habits, and conduct of Mr. Wilberforce, a

change which descended to the deepest seats of feeling,—which embraced the whole man in all his sympathies and relationships. This change resulted from no ordinary and skilful appliances, shaped by a profound sagacity, and designed from the first to be productive of such an end. It sprang up at a time when it was least to be expected, and owed its origin under God, to a man who was ignorant of its nature, and unconscious of its importance. It was opposed to all the natural prepossessions of the individual in whom it took place, threw a dark and repulsive shadow over the whole of his past life, subjected him to a thousand internal struggles from which he had hitherto been exempt, and brought forth peace and joy only as the fruit of protracted disquietude and deep self-humiliation. And this change was as permanent as it was radical. It did not pass away with the circumstances that produced it, but continued to distinguish the man in every occupation, and amid all possible varieties of company. It was a new element admitted to his moral constitution, and it spread on every hand, subduing prejudice, rectifying mistakes, and ennobling his spiritual nature with the higher growth of God's spiritual creation. But we must return to the narrative.

The new class of sentiments which had sprung up in his mind during his continental tour, were greatly deepened on his return to England. For some months he was in a state of painful depression, and engaged in a course of religious exercises, with a view of relieving his overburdened heart. Still his convictions were gathering strength, the seed was germinating, and a good harvest was speedily reaped. He determined on frankly announcing to his friends that his views were changed, and that they must look for a corresponding alteration in his deportment. Mr. Pitt was one of the first to whom the announcement was made, and he instantly replied, proposing to visit him at Wimbledon the next day. The prime minister was true to his appointment, and the following brief account is given by Mr. Wilberforce of the interview.

‘I had prayed,’ to God, I hope with some sincerity, not to lead me into disputing for my own exaltation, but for his glory. Conversed with Pitt near two hours, and opened myself completely to him. I admitted, that as far as I could conform to the world, with a perfect regard to my duty to God, myself, and my fellow-creatures, I was bound to do it; that no inward feelings ought to be taken as demonstrations of the Spirit being in any man (was not this too general? ‘Witnesseth with our Spirit,’ &c.) but only the change of disposition and conduct.’ ‘He tried to reason me out of my convictions, but soon found himself unable to combat their correctness, if Christianity were true. The fact is, he was so absorbed in politics, that he had never given himself time for due reflection on religion. But amongst other

things he declared to me, that Bishop Butler's work raised in his mind more doubts than it had answered.'—*ib.*, pp. 94, 95.

He now sought to renew his acquaintance with old John Newton; he withdrew his name from all the clubs of which he was a member; and began to realise the peace which accompanies an unreserved surrender of the heart to religion. The aspect of his piety was highly characteristic of the man. Without any deficiency of strength or compass, it was mainly visible in the growing benevolence of his spirit, the stricter regulation of his temper, his desire to subdue opposition and to overcome prejudice by a consistent display of the milder and more attractive features of the Christian character. This was shown in his solicitude to remove the impressions which his mother had received respecting his change. 'It may tend,' he remarks, when anticipating a meeting with her in 1786, 'to remove prejudices if I am 'more kind and affectionate than ever—consult her more—show 'respect for her judgment—and manifest rather humility in my-'self than dissatisfaction concerning others.' So completely did he accomplish his views, that a female friend of his mother, commenting on his cheerfulness and command of temper, remarked, 'If this is madness, I hope that he will bite us all.'

Some of his religious friends imprudently urged his retiring from public life, but—happily for the interests of humanity—their counsels were opposed by the sounder advice of others. It is strange, that men should permit their judgments to be so warped, as to take up the notion that the duties of a legislator are incompatible with the vocation of a Christian. The practical evils which would flow from the general adoption of such a theory suffice to expose its unsoundness. It is the growth of an unthinking and short-sighted piety; the dictate of a conscience more alive to a sense of danger, than solicitous for the discharge of duty. There are specific and appropriate obligations devolving on each member of society, and he fails to discharge them, who being summoned by the providence of God to the avocations of public life, refuses to enter on his appropriate sphere of labour. He may veil his reluctance under what plausible pretext he pleases, but in the eye of the great 'task-master,' he deserts his proper station, and forfeits the reward of a faithful servant.

Mr. Wilberforce remained at his post and the happiest consequences followed. Events had, for some time, been drawing public attention to the atrocious character of the African Slave-trade. Granville Sharpe, James Ramsay, Ignatius Latrobe, and other like-minded worthies had sought to arouse inquiry, and to diffuse information; while the Society of Friends, on several occasions, passed resolutions at their annual meetings, condemning the traffic, and warning their members against embarking in it.

It became, in consequence, the subject of remark, its nature was inquired into, and a growing feeling of repugnance and detestation towards it was springing up. In this work of philanthropy, Mr. Clarkson, then in the prime and vigour of his days, was actively engaged, and we cannot but express our deep regret at the course which the Messrs. Wilberforce have adopted towards this venerable man, now bending with age, and oppressed by grievous afflictions. We would willingly avoid recurrence to this theme, but justice to Mr. Clarkson, and what is of still greater importance, justice to the future interests of humanity, demand that we take some notice of it. The venerable apostle of Africa, who sacrificed fortune and health in its service, must not be surrendered to the splenetic attack to which he is here subjected. His reputation is the property of his species; and it must be protected, as such.

Since the first agitation of the question of the Abolition, in the year 1787, two names have been inseparable, and united in honour; that of Wilberforce, as the great parliamentary leader; and that of Clarkson, as the indefatigable labourer out of parliament. We never before heard of rivalry between them, or of conflicting claims by their respective friends; and it is with equal sorrow and surprise that we have read in this life of Mr. Wilberforce, a studied depreciation of his still surviving and revered associate. Scarcely any form of contempt is omitted, and in order to effect the purpose of degradation, the most unwarrantable expedient has been resorted to,—that of selecting from the mass of Mr. Wilberforce's papers, one or two letters by Mr. Clarkson of the most confidential character, for which act the authors make an apology far more offensive than the act itself; the consciousness of which they betray by an apology which appears to us unfounded in fact and illogical in conclusion. In bitter aggravation of this wrong, there appeared in the '*Edinburgh Review*' several weeks before the publication of the *Life*, an article which that early appearance (independently of the current report ascribing it to a near relation of the authors), would justify us in considering as an arrow from the same quiver though drawn by a different hand.* We feel ourselves under such circumstances well warranted in examining the allegations thus advanced. But we mean not to put our sickle into another man's harvest. We draw our materials solely from the *Life*, the review, and Mr. Clarkson's '*History of the Abolition.*' Whether the good old

* In the interest of a publisher, this is no rare occurrence; and, therefore, had the review appeared in the '*Quarterly*,' the inference would have been unfair; but when a publication from Albemarle-street is reviewed before its appearance in the '*Edinburgh Review*'—a connexion between the author and reviewer must be inferred.

man, the repose of whose latter days is thus assailed while suffering under grievous afflictions of body and mind, will have the strength or even the will to vindicate himself as he only can, is more than we know; but, in the meanwhile we will discharge a debt due to his great services, by showing the case as his very assailants leave it. Happily in vindicating the honour of the one good man, we need run no danger of wounding the reputation of the other; we disclaim the design of instituting any comparison between them. Unless, we greatly err, the biographers will be found in these portions of their work to have mistaken the character of their father, no less than that of his colleague, and if we might without presumption imagine his disembodied spirit as aware of earthly occurrences, and sharing human sensibility, we should conceive of him as feeling more acutely than any living man, an act at utter variance with his last best character, and most uncongenial with the sort of fame they would confer on him. For the sake of our young readers it may be necessary, briefly, to state the history of Mr. Clarkson's connexion with Mr. Wilberforce, and the Abolition as it appears in this book — requesting our readers only to bear in mind, in order that they may feel no distrust in the perusal of the few extracts we may make, or, facts we may borrow from the History, that the very Edinburgh reviewer himself, in an article in which the cause of Mr. Wilberforce against Mr. Clarkson—we regret to use such language—is urged with all the zeal of a partisan, remarks: ‘Remembering the vast age, the eminent services, and the spotless character of that venerable and excellent man, we must be permitted to express our very deep regret, that the ill-judged encomiums of his friends should have contributed to the publication of anything which could for a moment disturb the serenity of the closing scenes of a life distinguished, as we believe, by the exercise of every social and domestic virtue, and the most unwearied beneficence to men of every condition and every country.’

Mr. Clarkson, who, we understand, was born a few months after Mr. Wilberforce, being in 1785 a junior bachelor at Cambridge, was, from the mere desire to obtain a university prize, induced to write a Latin dissertation on the question, ‘*Anne liceat invitos in servitutem dare?*’ In the course of his inquiries into the nature of the slave-trade, his youthful sensibility and zeal were so wrought upon, that having gained the prize he resolved [1786] to abandon the church, in which he had taken Deacon's orders, and to devote himself to the effecting an abolition of the trade. He had had the education of a gentleman; inherited from his father a patrimony, which though small was amply sufficient for a country clergyman; and enjoyed the prospect of a handsome provision in the church. He repaired to London, where he found in addition to a few scattered individuals of all religious

persuasions, the Quakers, as a body, earnest in their desire to effect the Abolition. This occasioned an intimacy with the body of friends, which had a decisive influence on the whole of his life. He became the advocate and biographer of their William Penn. It determined his own literary character; for his habit of feeling as well as his style received a strong infusion of quakerish simplicity and *naïveté*, to which we believe much of our author's depreciation is owing.

It was on the 22nd of May, 1787, that that committee was formed who organized the society for the Abolition. The History and the Life alike inform us, that it consisted of twelve persons, of whom all but three, were quakers. The Life, we are sorry to remark, omits to state the material fact, that Mr. Clarkson was a member of this committee. Their chief, Mr. Granville Sharpe, already advanced in life was 'the father of the cause in England.' The other ten were merchants. Mr. Clarkson alone combined youth, zeal, and in consequence of the voluntary abandonment of his profession leisure for the office. In a word, he was *the working partner* in this noble firm, though the biographers are careful to designate him always as the *agent* of the society. And, in what sense they wish this to be understood, may be inferred from a passage in the fourth volume, in which Wilberforce speaks of some one acting under agency, as having no will of his own. But whether it were partner or agent, it is beyond all doubt, that from the first formation of the committee till his health was broken in the service, Mr. Clarkson was by far the most hard-worked of those persons whom Mr. Pitt called (and it is the only joke we recollect of the great minister) Wilberforce's *white negroes*. He repaired to Paris at an early period of the revolution, where he found among the revolutionists the most zealous *amis des noirs*, became, in consequence, intimate with La Fayette, Gregoire, &c., and, perhaps, a sort of Jacobin which harmonized ill with the Pitt-politics of Mr. Wilberforce. The sad course of the revolution was the great cause of the temporary failure of the Abolition cause. It was 1794-5, that the cause seemed for the moment desperate, and it was then that, utterly broken down in health and spirits, he was compelled to retire from the committee. After an affecting statement of the condition to which he was reduced, he says, 'For seven years I had a correspondence to maintain with four hundred persons with my own hands. I had some book or other, annually, to write on behalf of the cause. In this time, I had travelled more than 35,000 miles in search of evidence, and a great part of these journeys in the night. All this time, my mind had been on the stretch. It had been bent too to this one subject; for I had not even leisure to attend to my own concerns.' About this period he married, retired into the country, first, Westmoreland, and

then Suffolk, and never afterwards resided in London, though after nine years of absence he returned to the committee, and renewed his labours. They were become comparatively easy as they were short, for that which Mr. Wilberforce's great friend, Mr. Pitt, could not effect, was executed by the Whigs on their accession to power in 1807. In the following year, Mr. Clarkson published his 'History of the Rise, Progress, and Accomplishment of the Abolition,' of the Slave-trade. Had this book borne the title of *Memoirs* instead of *History*, no man could have taken exception to anything contained or omitted in it; for by 'Memoirs,' are properly designated such works as record facts, more especially within the knowledge and on the personal authority of the writer. Mr. Clarkson has ever since been removed from the public eye, except when the ulterior interests of the negro race required his occasional interference. While the sovereigns were at Paris, on the restoration of the Bourbons, and at the Congress at Aix-la-Chapelle, he was found at his post. On the questions concerning the foreign slave-trade emancipation, &c, he has seldom failed to make himself heard with the authority his name conveys. We recently read with pleasure an eloquent eulogy on him from Lord Brougham; and his individual petition to the House of Lords was distinguished by being read *in extenso* in the house; a distinction due to his exemplary character and services. But the press was then teeming with more than one work, written with the tendency as to both, and the undoubted design as to one, to degrade that character, and under-rate those services.

In the first volume of the *Life*, page 141, we find the following note on Mr. Clarkson's 'History of the Abolition.'

'Of this book it is necessary to declare at once, and with a very painful distinctness, that it conveys an entirely erroneous idea of the Abolition struggle. Without imputing to Mr. Clarkson any intentional unfairness, it may safely be affirmed, that his exaggerated estimate of his own service has led him unawares into numberless mis-statements. Particular instances might be easily enumerated, but the writers are most anxious to avoid any thing resembling controversy on this subject. Contenting themselves, therefore, with this declaration, they will henceforth simply tell their own story, without pointing out its contradictions of Mr. Clarkson's *History*.'

'Mr. Wilberforce himself looked into the book and saw enough to induce him to refuse to read lest he should be compelled to remark upon it. With a ready forgetfulness which they who knew him will understand at once, he told Mr. Clarkson, when obliged to give his opinion, that he was entirely satisfied with what was said about himself, but that, undoubtedly, justice was not done to Mr. Stephen.'

That is, Mr. Wilberforce, whose conscientious character was then formed and in full force, is supposed to have borne by his silence a negative testimony to the truth of the numberless mis-statements, and to have falsely asserted entire satisfaction. And

it is after a silence of thirty years, that his sons come forward to assert loudly what the father does not appear to have whispered. In other men it would be mere simplicity to say, they will 'simply tell their own story.' They can have no story of their own to tell. They can but compile a story from their father's papers. While Mr. Clarkson's narrative is entitled to full credit, having remained for thirty years uncontradicted by their father and all others, their story is entitled to no other credit than that which testimony may give it. The declining to point out particular mis-statements is a demand of implicit confidence by men writing, to say the least, under the influence of strong passions. No feeling leads to more injustice than contempt. They invite a comparison which they well know not one reader in a hundred will have the inclination and means to make. Their book, they are aware, will be in every house, the owner of which makes pretension to both religion and gentility; while Mr. Clarkson's history is to be met with chiefly in the houses of a few quakers. His style being characterized only by quaint simplicity renders it unattractive to worldlings, and the Messrs. Wilberforce may be quite certain the field will be their own.

The invitation, however, was not lost on us. We have reperused the History. Not knowing how to look for them, we, at least, have found no inconsistencies; and were there any, we should be far from thinking the credit due to the later writers. But the perusal has left on us an impression the very opposite of what the biographers may have anticipated. We were by nothing so much impressed as by the author's conscientious desire, to give to every man his due. The undeclared but indubitable source of all the acrimony towards Mr. Clarkson, betrayed by the sons of Mr. Wilberforce, is their impression, that he did not do full justice to their father. We wish our space permitted us to copy the whole of chapter 16, vol. i. p. 267—275, in which the author, imbued with the spirit of John Woolman and the other auto-biographic quaker-writers, anticipates and repels the charge of egotism. We can only abridge the characteristic image by which the Committee are likened to the human body, one man being an eye, another a head,—'As every limb is essentially necessary for the completion of a perfect work, so, in the case before us, every one was as necessary in his own office as another. For what, for example, could I myself have done, if I had not derived so much assistance from the Committee? What could Mr. Wilberforce have done in parliament, if I, on the other hand, had not collected that great body of evidence to which there was such a constant appeal? And what could the Committee have done without the parliamentary aid of Mr. Wilberforce?' And in mentioning this necessity of distinct offices and talents, he proceeds, 'and I feel myself bound by the feeling of justice to de-

‘liver it as my opinion, that knowing as I have done so many
‘members of both houses of our legislature, for many of whom I
‘have had a sincere respect, there was never yet one who ap-
‘peared to me to be so properly qualified, in all respects for the
‘management of the great cause, as he whose name I have just
‘mentioned. His connexions,’ &c. ‘his habits also of diligent
‘and persevering inquiry, made him master of all the knowledge
‘that was requisite for conducting it. His talents both in and
‘out of parliament made him a powerful advocate in its favour.
‘His character, free from the usual spots of human imperfection,
‘gave an appropriate lustre to the cause, making it look yet
‘more lovely, and enticing others to its support. But most of all
‘the motive on which he undertook it insured its progress. For
‘this did not originate in views of selfishness, or of party, or of
‘popular applause, but in an awful sense of his duty as a Christian.
‘It was this, which gave him alacrity and courage in his pursuit.
‘It was this which made him continue in his elevated situation of a
‘legislator, though it was unfavourable, if not to his health, at
‘least to his ease and comfort. It was this which made him incor-
‘porate this great object among the pursuits of his life, so that it
‘was daily in his thoughts. It was this, which, when year after
‘year of unsuccessful exertion returned, occasioned him to be yet
‘fresh and vigorous in spirit, and to persevere till the day of
‘triumph.’ This may appear to the family of Mr. Wilberforce a
‘damning with faint praise,’ but assuredly to no one else: and
we cannot credit the insinuation of the biographers, that his ex-
pression of satisfaction was but forced from him, and not quite
sincere !!! On the contrary, we deem this eulogy more congenial
with his purified nature than the testimonies of Madame de Staël
and other worldlings so carefully collected in the life. A more posi-
tive evidence how uncongenial the History is with the spirit of
the authors of the Life, appears in a sarcasm which would have
been in its place in a leading article of a party paper. Speaking
of Mr. Clarkson’s journey to Paris, at an early period of the re-
volution, it is said, vol. i. p. 230; ‘Mirabeau withstood a bribe in
his zeal for abolition; and the amiable Louis gave a no less em-
‘phatic pledge of favour in his unwearied perusal of one of Mr.
‘Clarkson’s volumes.’ Oh, how utterly extinct must the spirit
of the father have been in the breasts of his *Reverend* sons when
they penned this paragraph, which seems introduced, only, that
no form of contempt might be wanting! It is, on our parts, a
charitable construction, that the biographers could not sustain the
fatigue of perusing the History; and therefore are, in fact,
ignorant that Mr. Clarkson has anticipated them in every topic of
eulogy by which they have laboured (not dishonourably) to do
their father honour, except in his social and courtly qualities.

This is but a skirmishing before the main attack. This con-

sists in their having ferretted out of the mass of letters which Mr. Clarkson must have written to Mr. Wilberforce whether preserved or not, they only know, two confidential letters. By way of introduction to one, they remark that Mr. Wilberforce was annoyed by applications for the employment of his interest with the government on behalf of abolitionists. Such is, we believe, the fate of all ministerial members. And to illustrate this notorious fact, which needs neither illustration nor statement, the authors publish, not a whole letter, but a few sentences from one, in which Mr. Clarkson asserts his opinion, that Lord Chatham had behaved to his Mr. Clarkson's brother in a very scandalous manner; and that Mr. Wilberforce's own timidity was the occasion of his miscarrying in his promotion. Then follows a letter, supposed to have been sent by Mr. Wilberforce, full of anger, but so mixed up with respect and kindness that we think it most probable the letter was never sent, for he complains of want of eye-sight, and says, 'this is a letter wherein I cannot employ my *'amanuensis.'*' Is it likely, then, that he would have copied such a letter? And copying machines were not then in use. The *sent* letter could not have been in his cabinet. But it is marvellous that Mr. Wilberforce's sons, seeing that their father would not suffer his own confidential secretary to know of the letter, out of delicacy to Mr. Clarkson's feelings, should yet think themselves at liberty to publish it to all the world, thirty years afterwards, while Mr. Clarkson was still alive to suffer whatever the disclosure might inflict, and which they suppose probable, from the attempted apology. The great probability is, that the letter was thrown aside and not sent, and through inadvertence left undestroyed. Certain it is, that if the letter be in any way creditable to Mr. Wilberforce for its style or sentiments, the name might have been concealed, as our authors have done on other occasions. It is, however, very probable that after all, Mr. Clarkson was fully justified in all he wrote of Lord Chatham. Mr. Wilberforce's great partiality towards Lord Chatham's brother was long a subject of animadversion, and his giving no reply to the charge of scandalous behaviour against Lord Chatham, is almost an admission of the fact. Thus this blow, besides being a foul one in its nature, fails in its aim. It is injurious only to the publishers.

Another and still more serious attempt to cover with disgrace a name which their ally, the '*Edinburgh Reviewer*,' does not hesitate to say is, with that of Granville Sharpe, to be mentioned with '*peculiar veneration*,' will also be found offensive, less for what it actually discloses, than for the publishers' confession, in the way of apology, that they think the disclosure discreditable to Mr. Clarkson. It is thus introduced, 'Nor was it only by the violence of his opponents that his patience was tried. Many were the sources of annoyance which this cause furnished

‘its leader. Thus in the course of this spring [1794], he had ‘determined by a subscription amongst the adherents of the Abolition to reimburse Mr. Clarkson, whose broken health compelled ‘him to retire entirely from the contest in which he had taken so ‘warm a part. The conduct of such a business must, under any circumstances, have proved distasteful to him, &c. . . .’ Now every syllable of this seems to us penned by one utterly unable to appreciate the character of Mr. Wilberforce. It was *his own determination*, that Mr. Clarkson should be *reimbursed*. We should have thought that an act of such mere justice, would under no circumstances have proved *distasteful*. A letter is published from Wilberforce to Lord Muncaster which is the best exposition of his feelings. ‘The truth is that he has expended a considerable part of his little fortune, and though not perhaps very prudently, or even, necessarily, yet I think, judging liberally, that ‘he who has sacrificed so much time, and strength, and talents, ‘should not be suffered to be out of pocket too.’ So delicately did Mr. Wilberforce feel—so unlike his biographers—in all respects, that his wish was that there should be ‘no register of names or sums;’ but that an annuity for Clarkson should be bought, and he kept in ignorance of the proceeding. Lord Muncaster concurred with Wilberforce in thinking the reimbursement a mere act of justice, but doubted of its policy on account of the prevailing idea of Clarkson’s political prejudices, in other words, his *Jacobinism*—for so the radicalism of that day was called. This ‘fine scheme’ of concealment was spoiled. It reached Clarkson’s ears; and then, he acting with the characteristic simplicity of his nature, wrote about this subscription precisely as he would have done if it had been for any one else: he wrote even to Lord Muncaster, as well as to Mr. Wilberforce, and the letters are carefully copied. Mr. Clarkson partaking of the impression of his correspondents, that the subscription was a mere act of justice, suggested the propriety of their applying to certain individuals; with what propriety or impropriety we are not told.

Now we will, before we close this subject, venture a remark without fearing the charge of refinement. It is obvious that though every man’s character is formed from the result of all his actions, each individual action must be judged of from his character. These letters, from a man who was habitually selfish, would be justly deemed most selfish,—but, from one whose whole life was devoted to philanthropic and unselfish objects, must receive an opposite construction. They are proofs not of selfishness but of simplicity. In the habit of acting chiefly for others, he acted for himself as if he were another. It did not occur to him that he ought not to leave a written memorial of his interference, as it could not have occurred to Mr. W. that the privacy of his cabinet would be so abused by his sons and biographers.

Mr. W.'s answers to these letters are not given. We are merely told that £1,500 were raised,—what portion by Mr. W. does not appear. A silence that deserves remark, for either Mr. W. left a note of his own contribution, which his biographers thought it expedient to conceal, or he concealed the transaction altogether. And that concealment shows that they are acting in direct opposition to his feelings, and wishes, in the disclosure.

But, considering these letters solely with reference to the character of the writer, when we bear in mind that that writer had sacrificed his prospects in life, and worn out his health, his youth, and a considerable portion of his fortune, in the cause which the contributors to his *partial re-imbursement* professed to have at heart as much as himself, we think the authors need not profess so repeatedly much sorrow (vol. i. 141, ii. 38,) for the *necessity* of printing them. Far from *necessity*; there is not even *utility* in them; at the most they could illustrate the character of the writer, not the receiver.

Equally invalid is another suggestion in apology for these disclosures. 'They exhibit Mr. Wilberforce and Mr. Clarkson in 'relations very different from any thing that the History of the 'Abolition would suggest.' (i. 141.) Undoubtedly they do,—so differently as to have nothing whatever to do with the history of the abolition. Mr. Clarkson did not think it becoming in him to advert to *pecuniary* matters, either obligations or sacrifices; he once only relates that the committee wished to buy up his books for circulation, and that he would not permit them to pay more than the trade price! In fine, we are assured of this, that all persons who have any delicacy of sentiment, will feel that, at all events they would infinitely rather have written such letters than so published them; that the end to be gained bears no proportion to the reproach which the use of such means draws after it; that an executor is bound by the same laws of honour which bind his testator, and that the garbling of extracts from letters, and the selection of a few from many letters written in the confidence of friendship, and that by persons under the manifest influence of ill will, expose the actors to imputations which it grieves us to see rest on the sons of so exemplarily good a man.

Having, we trust, sufficiently repelled the implied charge of injustice to Mr. Wilberforce himself in the History of the Abolition, we would say one word on the only expressed particular charge, that of injustice to Mr. Stephen. Again, we say, we cannot draw our materials of exculpation but from the volumes themselves. Now it is to be remarked, that Mr. Clarkson's history terminates nearly with that of his own labours, which is certainly a notable defect. And we find in the Life (ii. 255), that it was not till the year 1798, that Mr. Stephen was in a condition openly to avow his devotion to the cause of abolition. Per-

sonal relations had before that time obliged him to keep his feelings secret. This appears from a letter of his dated August 1, 1797.

As to the general charge of egotism against Mr. Clarkson's book, we smile at it as proceeding from one who has no sense of the worth of the History. Its only value is as a chapter of autobiography; and egotism is its charm. Mr. Latrobe is cited as an authority; and this gentleman is noticed with praise by the Edinburgh Reviewer. A long letter by him is quoted, containing a statement which the biographers themselves deny the truth of. He says that many Reviews had brought this charge against Clarkson's History. This is loose writing. We are quite sure that the biographers spared no pains to find out these Reviews. They are enabled to mention only one, the *Christian Observer*, which it appears was set on foot by Mr. Wilberforce and his personal friends, (ii. 338). In fact, (we mention it not in dispraise of the periodical) the *Christian Observer* was always reported to be conducted by a very intimate friend of Mr. Wilberforce, one of the individuals whom the *Life* as industriously elevates, as it depreciates Mr. Clarkson, for whom, however, we feel nothing but high esteem; still, as an authority in a question between the friends of Mr. Wilberforce and Mr. Clarkson, the *Christian Observer* has the least possible weight. We will not oppose the Edinburgh Review of the present day to that of thirty years ago, because all but titular identity has been long lost. The last occasion on which Mr. Clarkson's name is introduced, is one which ill agrees with the preceding endeavours to represent him as a mere agent. It was in 1818, when Mr. Wilberforce was anxious that an endeavour should be made to obtain through the Emperor Alexander, at Aix la Chapelle, from the sovereigns there assembled, a declaration, that the slave-trade should be deemed piracy. There being objections to his own going, or to Mr. Stephen going, he writes: 'Clarkson seems formed by Providence for the purpose; . . . he is the only man that could go and carry our representations who may be suffered to go of his own impulse, and not deputed by us. Then he will be more acceptable than most to the Emperor Alexander [who probably had not undergone the penance of reading one of his volumes] and we may depend on his being in earnest: he would be regarded as half quaker, and may do eccentric things with less offence than you or I could.' We have learned elsewhere that Mr. Wilberforce would speak freely of the eccentricities of Clarkson; but so mingled with affection and esteem, as, while limited to private circulation, not to interfere with the indulgence and enhancement of the best affections: nor are we willing to believe that any other than our authors themselves are without a due sense of all those virtues and excellencies from

which eccentricities are an unimportant deduction. We would on no account except the Edinburgh Reviewer, who seems to labour with conflicting feelings; his conscience compelled him to bear testimony to the high character of Mr. Clarkson; but his main object still was to defend his friends; and for that purpose he makes use of suggestions to justify their conduct, which, with respect to them, at least, have the appearance of after-thoughts. We could forgive the Reviewer for his *plaidoyer* in favour of his friends, if it were not at the cost of the man whom he states to be entitled to peculiar veneration. Among the far-fetched arguments thus forensically brought forward, is one to prove that Clarkson himself claimed undue credit, which we consider most unfair. We are told that 'in a map prefixed to his History that gigantic evil [the slave trade] is represented under the image of a mound, placed at the confluence of four rivers, and of these streams one takes near its source the name of Clarkson, into which the rivulet of Wilberforce is seen to fall much lower down. His sons exclaim against this hydrography, and propose to correct the map by converting this tributary flood into the main channel.'

Here again, we mean not to impute to the distinguished reviewer a wilful misrepresentation. We, however, do not hesitate to say, with the map before our eyes, that this statement is grossly incorrect. There are some hundreds of these rivulets, each with a name, running into various larger channels. There is the name of Wilberforce to one, and it is a long rivulet before it joins the common stream. There is the name of Clarkson to one of these rivulets, much shorter, but the engraver has printed it near the stream, through accident. It could not possibly have the meaning so invidiously put by the Reviewer, for otherwise there would be a rivulet without a name; and no name is given to any one of the larger currents, except that of William Dillwyn, who is named repeatedly, as he was the channel of communication between the American and English abolitionists. According to the map, neither Clarkson nor Wilberforce could be a main channel. We are almost ashamed to advert to such frivolities. They show how anxiously the advocate omits no argument, however slight, to support his friends—a solicitude betraying disquietude.

Another charge of undue assumption of influence is brought against Clarkson, because Wilberforce before he knew Clarkson had known Mr. Pitt, and even conferred with him on the slave-trade, while Clarkson claims the credit of making a convert of Mr. Pitt. Here again the Reviewer seems to have read the text of Mr. Clarkson as inattentively as he slightly looked over the map. He states, History i. 472, that Mr. Wilberforce [had opened the way for him with Mr. Pitt; that he carried his books,

papers, and African productions, to the minister who had before little knowledge on the subject; he describes the premier as turning over, leaf after leaf, 'above a hundred pages' accurately; as confessing 'with some emotion that his doubts were 'wholly removed. He thanked me for the light I had given him 'on many branches of this great question, and I went away under 'a certain conviction that I had left him much impressed in our 'favour.' It is really discreditable to the Reviewer, as a man of business, that he should have supposed it a contradiction of such a statement as this, that 'years before' Mr. Wilberforce had conferred with Mr. Pitt. Years before, neither Mr. Wilberforce himself nor Mr. Clarkson knew of these things in their details. The facts had been in the meanwhile collected, and made available as evidence by the committee, and chiefly by Mr. Clarkson. In the Reviewer's summary there are other items which seem to us equally gratuitous; such as that Wilberforce was at the personal expense of some of Clarkson's labours, of which we see no evidence in the printed book. They may be family traditions. We must proceed to more serious and more exceptionable matter—the Reviewer's attempted justification of the unjustifiable breach of confidence in the publication of the letters. 'In these volumes 'will be found a correspondence, the publication of which we cannot condemn:' [but, unless the idea of condemnation had forced itself strongly on the Reviewer, he would not have framed such a sentence;] although we think that nothing but the filial duty of vindicating their father's highest title to renown could have justified his sons in giving it to the world.' This is a marvellous *non-sequitur*. As if the involuntary reception of letters of any description—for no act of Wilberforce's thereon of the least moment, is shown, were his highest title to renown! But this we have already refuted. The effect of it (the correspondence) is to show that Mr. Clarkson's *services were remunerated by a large subscription*. And what if it had been so, as far as Wilberforce's character is concerned? but in truth this is so flagrant a deviation from the text on which the Reviewer had to comment, that it distresses more, on account of our esteem for the supposed author, than any thing in the Review. On the one hand, the profession and official habits of the reputed writer forbid our supposing that through inadvertence he confounded remuneration for services with reimbursement of money out of pocket (the expression both of Lord Manchester and Mr. Wilberforce): and on the other hand, his personal character will not permit us to ascribe to him a wilful misrepresentation. We confidently expect an explanation, at least, if not an apology, in the next number of the Review.

On the comparatively insignificant question, who first stirred in this great work, the Reviewer declines the discussion, and im-

mediately proceeds to give a decision in Mr. Wilberforce's favour. This question is embarrassed only by inattention to an obvious distinction. Mr. Clarkson was already a senior bachelor at Cambridge, when he first heard of the slave-trade; Mr. Wilberforce heard of it and wrote a letter about it to a magazine when at school; he therefore in that respect preceded Mr. Clarkson. And what then? It appears that Mr. Clarkson formed his heroic and magnanimous resolution to abandon his profession for this great work in 1786. An autographic note by Mr. Wilberforce shows that his like resolution was formed in 1787. But we do not think that we raise Clarkson a hair's breadth above Wilberforce in so saying. Nothing turns on the insignificant question of time. Indeed, we hold all comparison needless, and worse than useless, if made for the purpose of depreciation; but the question of *time* is absolutely unmeaning, even were it of importance to weigh the relative merit. That would depend on the degree of sacrifice made on the one hand, by a young gentleman of rank and fortune, who abandoned the usual pursuits of his age and station, and devoted rare and manifold talents to the conduct of a great cause of which he became the acknowledged head, and enjoyed all the distinction while he sustained the labour of the 'painful pre-eminence:' and on the other hand, by a young man without rank or fortune, who applied talents less varied and popular, but still rare, with a sacrifice of an honourable profession, and the means of advancement in life, to humbler and comparatively obscure labour in the same great cause. While the name of Wilberforce was bruited throughout Europe, by means of the public prints, Mr. Clarkson's influence was greatly owing to his personal demeanor. Without the aid of station or fortune, the gravity, great earnestness, and quakerish simplicity of his appearance—adding *eccentricities*, if the authors wish it—made his presence a sort of phenomenon among great men, and men of the world. He was at home only among the quakers and other sectaries: thus there was as little personal as there was literary rivalry between Wilberforce and Clarkson. Yet it is on the pretence that Mr. Wilberforce has been defrauded of his fame that the Reviewer would justify his sons in their attack on Mr. Clarkson, as if it were a measure of defence. He goes so widely out of his way as to fix on a very idle word that has fallen from a modern writer, who we believe was never in Mr. Clarkson's company, and we are persuaded never thought of uttering a sneer or a sarcasm at Wilberforce's expense. Mr. Serjeant Talfourd, in his charming collection of Charles Lamb's letters, incidentally says: 'There he (Lamb) met with the true annihilator of the 'slave-trade, Thomas Clarkson. Lamb had no taste for oratorical 'philanthropy, but he felt the grandeur and simplicity of Clark-

‘son’s character.’ The Reviewer remarks, ‘No man ever so little merited the condemnation which the language of Mr. Talfourd must be supposed to convey.’ *Must be supposed!* By whom and why? We will not impute to the Reviewer so unworthy an artifice as that he affected an application to Mr. Wilberforce of the Serjeant’s words in order thereon to hang an apology for his friends. But of this we are sure, that the application is gratuitous. Mr. Serjeant Talfourd is a young man, and can have no personal knowledge of the great abolition struggle; but he knows at least that Mr. Wilberforce was the parliamentary leader: he is an able man of business, and knows what it is to marshal evidence, to preside over committees, and conduct for many years a parliamentary investigation opposed to active and interested adversaries. He could not possibly have meant to designate such labours by the contemptuous phrase ‘oratorical philanthropy.’ We suspect that he alluded to a very different class of persons, towards even whom we cannot approve of directing any words of scorn—the speakers at public meetings, where certainly a cheap reputation may be gained by advocating a cause after it is won; at which an oratorical appeal is made to the sensibilities of an applauding audience, and who verily in such applause may have their reward.

The Reviewer then cites the great names of Southey and Wordsworth as of persons wrongfully exalting Mr. Clarkson to a station in public opinion to which he is not entitled. As to Mr. Southey we are not aware of what he has written; but, whatever it may be, we cannot but imagine that our authors have not adopted the fittest means to redress the injury. It appears, from frequent passages in the *Life*, that the laureat not only enjoyed the high esteem and even friendship of Mr. Wilberforce, but that he has been applied to by the biographers, and has contributed anecdotes of his intercourse with him. Now if the biographers really believed that he was among those who had injuriously given ‘to Titus old Vespasian’s due,’ we cannot account for their not remonstrating with him, and obtaining from him a retraction of the unmerited praise. No one could possibly have blamed this, while the injustice is manifest of not resenting the wrong on the real offender, but of drawing from that wrong a plea by their advocate for a breach of that confidence which is held sacred among honourable correspondents and their representatives. One fine Sonnet has been penned by Mr. Wordsworth, but sadly diseased must the sons and friends of Mr. Wilberforce be if it should wound them as an implied detraction of their kinsman. It is probable that such imperishable words have not been, and never may be uttered in his praise. The Sonnet does assert the claim of Mr. Clarkson to priority in the struggle;

but we are very sure, without the slightest thought of giving an opinion on a disputed claim: nor does Mr. Wilberforce appear to have thought so, for he had frequent intercourse with Mr. Wordsworth, and we hear of no reproach or remonstrance for these lines,

‘——— thou who starting in thy fervent prime,
Didst first lead forth that enterprise sublime.’

We have heard of prophecies that effect their own fulfilment. Grievously would the poet lament should his affectionate testimony have stimulated the evil passions that threaten to withdraw the promised reward—

‘The blood-stained writing is for ever torn;
And thou henceforth wilt have a good man’s calm,
A great man’s happiness.’

We have faith in the prophecy, though we are well aware that this blow tends to the destruction of it. It falls on a head aged as well as honoured. We know that this venerable apostle of philanthropy has suffered severe bodily afflictions, of blindness—the frequent companion of old age—and bereavements of the heart, by which Providence tries its most exemplary servants. Yet we are assured that an approving conscience will enable him to sustain this attack, though inflicted by the sons of the man whom he had reckoned among the dearest and the most revered of his friends; and with whose name (in their despatch) we fondly believe his own is destined to go down to posterity, among those of the best of men, in an age not unproductive of greatness and goodness of every description.

We regret the length to which our remarks have extended, but our sense of what was due to Mr. Clarkson has compelled us to proceed. We should not have done justice to our own feelings, nor have met the righteous demands of the case, had we said less, and we must therefore content ourselves with deferring to another month our notice of the multifarious and deeply interesting contents of these volumes.

- Art. V. 1. *A Speech delivered by Thomas Noon Talfourd, Serjeant at Law, in the House of Commons, on Thursday the 18th of May, 1837, on moving for leave to bring in a Bill to consolidate the Law relating to Copyright, and to extend the term of its duration.* London: Edward Moxon. 1837.
2. *A Bill to amend the Law relating to Copyright. Prepared and brought in by Mr. Serjeant Talfourd, Lord Viscount Mahon, Sir Robert Inglis, and Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer. Ordered by the House of Commons to be printed 27th of February, 1838.*
3. *Remarks on the Speech of Serjeant Talfourd.* By THOMAS TEGG, Bookseller. London: Tegg and Son. 1837.
4. *Observations on the Law of Copyright.* Printed for Scott, Webster, and Geary. 1838.
5. *Brief Objections to Mr. Talfourd's new Copyright Bill.* By W. and R. CHAMBERS. Edinburgh.

LITERARY property is of comparatively recent date. It is since the invention of printing and the consequent power of indefinitely multiplying copies of a literary composition, that the writing and publishing of books have become common means of acquiring wealth. The consideration that every man is entitled to the fruits of his own labour gave rise to the legal protection of the proprietors of books in the retention of their exclusive privilege to print and publish them. This exclusive privilege appears to have been perpetual, and its perpetuity seems to have been undisputed, in this country till the reign of Queen Anne. It was usual 'to purchase from authors the perpetual copyright of 'their books, and to assign the same from hand to hand for valuable considerations, and to make them the subject of family 'settlements.* In the reign of Anne, however, an act was passed, professedly 'for the encouragement of learning,' but in reality to limit the term of copyright to fourteen years, and, if the author should be living at the expiration of that time, for another period of the same duration. How far the provisions of this statute affected the common law right of copy has been disputed, and there are several curious decisions of the Court of Chancery on record relative to particular cases. The universities and the public schools of Eton, Winchester, and Westminster, have never been robbed of their perpetual copyright. They enjoy it still. Clarendon's History is an Oxford book.

In the year 1814, by the statute 54 George III., c. 156, which mainly regulates literary property at present, the duration of copyright was extended; it was enacted, that after the passing of this act, the author of any book, and his assigns, shall have the

* Serjeant Talfourd's Speech, p. 2.

sole liberty of printing and reprinting such book for the full term of twenty-eight years from the day of publication, and if the author shall be living at the end of that period, for the residue of his natural life. In the words of Mr. Talfourd, 'the term of 'twenty-eight years, with the possible reversion beyond that time for 'life, is all authors have yet obtained in return for that inheritance 'of which the statute of Anne deprived them.' About a year ago, Mr. Serjeant Talfourd moved for leave to bring in a bill, the main object of which was to extend the term of copyright to sixty years beyond the death of the author. Mr. Serjeant Talfourd, though of opinion, that *perpetual* copyright *ought* to be restored, proposes this extension in compliance with the views on the subject, which have been so long entertained by others.

'Although,' he says, 'I see no reason why authors should not be restored to that inheritance, which, under the name of protection and encouragement, has been taken from them, I feel that the subject has so long been treated as matter of compromise between those who deny that the creations of the inventive faculty, or the achievements of reason, are the subjects of property at all, and those who think the property, should last as long as the works which contain truth and beauty live, that I propose still to treat it on the principle of compromise, and to rest satisfied with a fairer adjustment of the difference than the last act of parliament affords. I shall propose, subject to modification when the details of the measure shall be discussed—that the term of property in all works of learning, genius, and art, to be produced hereafter, or in which the statutable copyright now subsists, shall be extended to sixty years, to be computed from the death of the author; which will, at least, enable him, while providing for the instruction and delight of distant ages, to contemplate that he shall leave in his works themselves some legacy to those for whom a nearer, if not a higher duty, requires him to provide, and which shall make 'death 'less terrible.'—p. 8.

We propose to make a few remarks on the general principles of the bill, and to examine some of the arguments which have been urged against it. On this subject there are in the main but two opinions, 'the extreme point of one being, that, by giving 'his thoughts to the world, an author abandons all right to consider the vehicle as private property: and of the other, that he 'has the right in perpetuity, that descends to his heirs and is transferable to those to whom he or they may assign it.'*

In refutation of the former of these opinions, in its broad and unqualified form, it is sufficient to say, that the public have no *right* to the work of an author at all. They have no claim on him

* (*Wordsworth's Letter to Mr. Serjeant Talfourd*, published in the *Athenæum*, May 5th, 1838).

to publish his book, he lies under no obligation to impart his ideas to them at all, and it is, therefore, absurd to say that they have a right to the free use of it as a property and means of acquiring wealth. It is pretended, that it is not for the public interest that authors should enjoy a perpetual copyright in their books, and, therefore, they should be robbed of it after a certain time. What would be thought of this mode of arguing in other things? If it were to be proposed to deprive a landholder of his estate after thirty years, because he had been sufficiently remunerated for his outlay and trouble in getting it, and that it would be more for the public interest and health to turn it into a common, the absurdity and injustice of the proposition would be manifest even to the dullest. Are books property, or are they not? The question is not, are they property till the author shall have been sufficiently remunerated? Are they property? Are they solid, genuine property? If they are, on what principle can we ever fix a point of time when the ownership is to cease? Doubtless, the public would *like* very well to be able to buy the 'Bridgewater Treatises,' for example, for a seventh of the actual price; but is that a reason, why the property should be alienated or thrown open altogether? Some who have written on the subject seem to imagine that if a book is cheap, that is every thing, all that is wanted. But are books to be made cheap by law? Are authors or other proprietors of copyrights to be robbed of their books, because they will not publish them cheap? Who has a right to fix the price, but the proprietor? The public are not obliged to buy, no injunction is laid on them to purchase any particular book. The matter is purely optional. If they do not think a book worth the price put upon it, they need not buy it. That it is politic in proprietors of books to publish them cheap, we do not deny; their utility is increased, and the profits are enlarged.

'Alison's History of Europe,' from the commencement of the French revolution, a work in seven octavo volumes, published at about fifteen shillings a volume, might, doubtless, have been printed in the form of 'Lardner's Cyclopædia,' at six shillings a volume. The three-volumed novels, at a guinea-and-a-half each, *could* be printed and published for a few shillings; but they are not. The public are not injured hereby; they only do not get what the proprietor did not see fit to give. The real and legitimate security for books being published at a *reasonable* price is to be sought in the tendency of everything to find its level. If a book was not published at a reasonable rate, no one would buy it; and knowing that, no proprietor of a book would be foolish enough to affix a price which would debar the public from the purchase of it.

But what is a reasonable price for a book or for a copyright? Mr. Tegg seems to think, literary labour as easy to be valued as

any other labour, and he regards it purely *as labour*. A book of ten sheets is worth so much, one of fifteen sheets is amply paid for by so much, and so forth. This is a mode of reckoning very well suited to manual labour, but not equally applicable to mental efforts. A celebrated Italian artist was once asked by a person in a coffee-house to draw a picture of a horse for him; he said, 'he should like exceedingly to have one of his drawing;' the artist sat down, and in five minutes, produced a beautiful picture; he asked thirty francs for it. 'What!' exclaimed the astonished amateur, 'thirty francs for that! why, it has not taken you above five minutes to do it.' True; it had not taken more than five minutes to produce that particular picture, but how long had it taken to acquire the skill which enabled him to produce it? Ought he not to be paid for that? This is a point which is often overlooked in estimating the value of a book. If an author receives a thousand pounds for a book which he has been only six months in writing, it is considered by ignorant persons an extravagant sum; but how much study, how many precious years of laborious research or of elaborate culture were necessary to enable him to write it, this is forgotten. This is a most important peculiarity in literary labour, and renders it often very difficult to estimate what *is* a fair remuneration. The notion that the mere time employed in the composition is a criterion, is most erroneous and absurd. It reminds us of the countryman who went to a regular dentist in London to have a tooth extracted; the dentist performed the operation very much to the bumpkin's satisfaction; the tooth was out almost before he knew what he was about; but when the dentist informed him that the charge was half-a-guinea, he demurred, and exclaimed, 'Half-a-guinea! Why, I could have had it done at home for nine-pence, and been dragged three times round the blacksmith's shop into the bargain.'

It is not meant to be insinuated by these observations, that publishers should give a price for books which would be ruinous to themselves, or that they should forego, still less, that they should be deprived of, a fair interest on the outlay of capital which they make in bringing works before the public: but it *is* meant to be implied that abundant argument is hereby furnished, why, after the expiration of the time for which the authors sold their copyright, *they* (the authors) should have the *chance* of additional remuneration, which, in fact, is nothing more than the voluntary homage paid by the public to literary talent. If *they* have no right to this *chance*, who has? Surely, not A, B, C, or D, who may happen to be able to scamp up an edition of the work for a fortieth of the original price. As Mr. Serjeant Talfourd observes, 'the rare instances in which copyright retains its value beyond twenty-eight years, are those in which the author had most merit; and, perhaps, received an inconsiderable remuneration.'

'neration, though adequate to the immediate prospects of his 'success.'

Mr. Tegg is wrong in supposing and arguing on the supposition, that the end proposed by the law of copyright is public advantage, and not individual reward. The end actually and legitimately proposed by the law of copyright is individual reward, *and, therefore*, public advantage. Is it an advantage to the public, that its authors should be worse paid than its mechanics? Is it an advantage to the public, that its authors should be supported by common charity? Is it an advantage to the public, that its authors should be robbed of the fruit of that labour which if directed in another and inferior channel, would have furnished a competence for their families? The interest of authors is not alien from, but one and the same with that of the public. The object of a copyright law is, to secure to authors their right in that property of which they have been the producers; the object is individual reward; in every case, it is the author whose remuneration is legitimately contemplated by a copyright law.

Mr. Tegg is perfectly right in saying, that when Milton meditated 'to adorn his country by some great performance,' when he wrought upon it with the divine fervour and energy of the true poet, he had no thoughts of pecuniary reward; and, that, he laboured solely under the poetic impulse, exalted as he tells us, with the pious hope 'to justify the ways of God to man.' But it is making an ungenerous and unjust use of this fact, the glory of literature, to adduce it as an argument against literary property. Was Milton's *right* in his great work as a property, less in proportion to the nobleness of his impulse? Is the interest taken in the composition of a work, or the exceeding weight of fame which it is expected to bring, a reason against high pecuniary remuneration? This is an argument which, by proving too much, proves nothing. If it were valid to show, that Milton was sufficiently rewarded by the five pounds which he received for the 'Paradise Lost,' it would as well prove, that he would have been sufficiently rewarded without money at all. And if this is true of authors, with how much more force might it be pleaded against the clerical and the medical profession. Because a sincere and zealous minister receives his highest reward for his labours in the reformed character and spiritual improvement of his hearers; or, because, the honest and enlightened physician sees his most valued remuneration in the recovery of his almost dying friend, is this a reason why the one or the other should go unpaid? Should it not rather have the opposite effect, and show that by how much the higher and nobler the impulse, by so much the larger should be the reward? The common sense and integrity of mankind have decided the question.

The booksellers who have come forward on this occasion, seem

to have little or no higher idea of literary composition than of brickmaking or paper-making. They argue as if it were labour of the same kind, to be valued by a similar scale, and regulated on the same principles. They say, that the most numerous class of literary men are those who write '*to order of a publisher*,' (these are the words of Messrs. Chambers of Edinburgh), and that the *minority* are those who write from the influence of their own fancy. It may be so. We do not deny it, but is this a wholesome state of things? Does this indicate a high order of literature, or a high-minded feeling in literary men? The bookselling idea of literary men is of literary drudges, writing hacks, book making mechanics, mere jobbers, to be worked as such, and their work to be estimated in the same way as that of other operatives? That there *are* such men we do not deny; that the opponents of Mr. Talfourd's measure know and employ such men, we do not deny; and further we do not deny that such men may be, and generally are respectable, well-deserving men, but most of them have mistaken their profession. Many of them have been absolutely *thrown* on literature. If all the authors of this class were to take to some other profession, we doubt whether we should lose much sterling literature. We believe, that the most valuable works are those which are written without any prospect of publication, which fall in the writer's own line of study, or favourite pursuit. For ourselves, we can say, and we conceive the majority of literary men will respond to the statement of our own experience, that that part of a work which has afforded us the most pleasure, has been that which we have written by the voluntary propension of our own minds, from a pure penchant for the subject, before it had assumed the form of a book, and before the pleasure of composition had been mixed with the anticipations of ulterior reward. We have, sometimes, found that as soon as we had conferred with a publisher, and had *engaged* to complete the book, it became almost a task-work instead of an amusement, it lost its peculiar charm, we continued as by compulsion, what we had begun for pleasure. As soon as composition becomes compulsory it loses its genial tone, it is up-hill work, it lacks that pleasurable and self-rewarding spontaneity of impulse which is the most salutary stimulus of learning and of genius. Far be it from us to speak querulously of publishers. We have met with uniform liberality. We only state an actual feeling, and we believe, intelligent publishers will readily appreciate its reality. They must be aware, that whatever may be *their* justice or generosity in pecuniary payment, the most abiding and inalienable remuneration of authors who are worthy of the name, is of an intellectual nature, and consists in the self-moved interest they have themselves taken in the composition; in the satisfaction they have derived from the

solution of some difficulty, or from the enucleation of some valuable but before-hidden truth, or from some happy expression by which they have succeeded in giving the exact transcript of a thought. The desire of fame, we believe, never exists as an active principle in authors, apart from these spontaneous and purely intellectual sources of reward. Isocrates is said to have shed tears on the first receipt of a stipend. It is said, that Robert Hall was more than once offered £1000 if he would write a volume of sermons for publication, and refused to do so. He *could* not have done it. The idea of the price would have haunted him in every line he wrote. He would have thought, when he had written a page, that was worth so much, two pages so much, a whole sermon so much. In fact he could not prostitute his intellect to such pounds-shillings-and-pence composition. He was not incapable of receiving £1000 for what he *had* written, but he was utterly incapable of writing a volume *for* £1000. These are two things widely different. How would the finest bursts of eloquence have been marred by the thought of the uncongeniality of the reward to the labour! At the same time, no man will be paltry enough to say, that if the sermons had been written and published, he was not entitled to regard them as his property, and, as such, to receive the profits arising from their sale; merely, because, his highest impulse was of a nobler nature.

We very often see in the preface to a book the expression of some such sentiment as this, that the author has been amply rewarded for his labour by the pleasure he has derived from the prosecution of his subject. And whoso doubts it, is a stranger to the pleasures of authorship. But as we said before, it is a mean thing in an opponent of literary property, to use this as an argument against high pecuniary remuneration for the literary achievements of genius; in the words of Mr. Talfourd, 'they make an ungenerous use of the very nobleness of its impulses, and show how little they have profited by its high example.'

What is to be thought of such a declaration as this—'Authors of great acquirements and talents do not want the stimulus of *additional* pecuniary encouragement: those of the highest class write in many cases, from the hope of fame and professional distinction, but know also, that they need not want pecuniary remuneration; and what advantage is it to the public to flog on the inferior artists?' (Mr. Tegg's pamphlet, p. 8). This passage shows a total misunderstanding of the question. It is not as *stimulus*, that the extension of the copyright is regarded, but as a part of that bare naked justice which is the common right of every man. It is not as a spur to genius, that the extension will operate, it is not as a favour it is asked, it is not as a matter of charity it is sought; but as the removal of a feeling of injury, a wiping out of the monstrous anomaly sometimes witnessed, of an author or his

descendants in poverty, and others batten on the profits of his labour. *Probitas laudatur et alget.*

It is supposed by the Messrs. Chambers, that our school treatises are chiefly written by literary men, 'to order of a publisher.' We do not believe that one *good* school book in twenty originates in this way. We believe that the best school books are made by practical teachers, actually and regularly engaged in the business of instruction. We believe that these books grow as wants are felt by the teacher; and that they are generally written with a primary view to the advantage of the writer's own pupils. This is, in fact, the *only* way in which a good school book (except in one or two inferior departments) can be made. The best school-book is the used-before-published school-book. No school-book ought to be published before it has been used and tried and experimented on. We will even go farther, and we shall not be going too far, we believe, when we say, that the best books in all departments of literature have, for the most part, been written by persons engaged in regular professional or other business, that they have been written as the *παράεργα* of active minds, by men deriving an income, on which they rely, either from some profession or business, or else from private property. The best books have not been produced by those who may be called authors-by-profession; and the advice of all literary men for the benefit of authors, and for the good of literature, is *against* relying on authorship as a profession or business. Every one remembers Sir Walter Scott's saying, that 'literature is a good walking-stick, but a bad crutch,' and Cobbett's advice is in the same spirit: 'Stick to the shop; rely upon your mercantile, or mechanical, or professional calling; try your strength in literature, if you like; but *rely* on the shop.' Coleridge's remarks are well known, but are too good not to be quoted in connexion with this subject. '*Never,*' says he, '*never pursue literature as a trade.*' With the exception of one extraordinary man, I have never known an individual, least of all an individual of genius, healthy or happy without a profession, that is, some regular employment, which does not depend on the will of the moment, and which can be carried on so far mechanically, that an average quantum of health, spirits, and intellectual exertion are requisite to its faithful discharge.' The fact is, that valuable authorship is too expensive a thing for a profession, it requires more buoyancy and elasticity and free scope of mind than can be enjoyed but by few men, when the means of living are depending on the composition. High authorship requires, above all, a mind not forced or hampered by necessity.

The most valuable works, then, we say, are produced by men who do not rely on those works for their living. They are pro-

duced by men on whom the Scotch threat — that ‘no publisher would give employment to a writer, unless he (the publisher) was to be registered as the author’ — would have little effect. And if this is the case with all books, how much more with school-books! Every teacher who teaches with zest, and enters with a genial spirit into the processes of instruction, will make and use his own plan; he will find wants, and if he possesses the time, and the talents, and the industry, he will probably seek to supply them; thus good working school-books are made. The reason why treatises on education have generally been so vapid and so shallow is, that they have so often been written by unprofessional men, by men who have not *known* and have had little or no means of *knowing*, what education is. They have written from the study, not from the school-room. After all, ‘Knox’s Essays on Education,’ the actual result of a long experience, contain more really valuable matter, more truth, than any ten books on the subject which have been published since. And the reason why our school-books are often so bad, is that they are not written by teachers, or are not used till they are printed. One reason why so much rubbish is written is, that multitudes of persons write, not because *they have something to write*, but because *they have to write something* — two things widely different.

One of the most egregious and most palpable fallacies which have been broached on this subject is in the words of Messrs. Chambers, that ‘books are ideas in print; but that these ideas, however much improved and embellished by genius, are after all ‘only common property.’ *Ideas in print!* We should like to be informed, how ideas are printed, by what process a notion is stereotyped, or a thought lithographed. Can it really have escaped the notice of those who have used this argument, that they have passed over one step, and that the most important of all. Books are *words* in print, not ideas. Copyright belongs not to ideas alone, but words expressing ideas. Now this is a most material consideration, and, at once, shows a broad distinction between a patent and a copyright. Two men without any communication whatever, by merely availing themselves of the existing state of science, which seems often in a wonderful manner to scatter germs of kindred thought simultaneously in different minds, two such men, working on the same subject, at a great distance from one another, might very possibly hit on the same development of a scientific principle, and be led to the construction of a machine on the same plan, for the same purpose. But that two men without communication should adopt the same ideas and the same modes of expression, for any number of sentences together, is not possible. It is not a conceivable case, that an author in Cornwall and an author in Edinburgh,

should independently write the same words. And to say that the ideas of A expressed in given words are public property, because, B might have expressed the same ideas in other words, is no argument at all.

We wonder that these opponents have not contended that, because all English books are composed of the twenty-four letters and the nine figures, which are public property, there should be no copyright at all. The very same arguments which would show that a copyright should cease after a few years, would show that there should be none at all; which would be palpably unjust and absurd. 'Every book,' say the Messrs. Chambers, 'issued to the world has been written in virtue of the author drawing on the common literature of the country for assistance. He could not have written, had he not been indebted to public institutions, public libraries, and to out-of-copyright books. The whole intellect of society is but a result of the free circulation of literature.' Is it not obvious that this argument would be as applicable to any other species of property as to books? How could a man build a house if he had not drawn on the knowledge and experience of the past? Is that a reason why he should be robbed of the fruit of his labour? Because Robert Hall formed his style, and refined his mind, by the study of the greatest authors, ancient and modern, had he therefore no claim to consider as his own those matchless compositions in which he has embodied our idea of all that is polished and graceful in language? Because Charles Lamb studied Beaumont and Fletcher, were not his writings his own productions? and were not his own productions his own property? Because Byron adopted the Spenserian stanza, was not the Childe Harold the property of the writer? We have heard of an old gentleman, in a town in the West of England, who used frequently to amuse his morning's leisure by walking into the fish-market and seeing what was to be seen. On inquiring, and being told the price of a fish, he would express a feigned astonishment, and wonder how they could have the face to ask so much for the fish. 'The fish,' he would say to the seller, 'is as much *mine* as *yours*; I have no objection to give you a trifle for *catching* it.' This is the argument of the Messrs. Chambers, of Edinburgh.

The objections of the booksellers are of a strangely contradictory character. They wish to show that authors will not be benefited by the extension of the copyright, that they will get nothing by it. Yet in the same breath they say, that they (the booksellers) will be injured. They say that books for the most part are not worth anything after thirty years! then why do they want to retain them after that time? If copyrights are so valueless as they pretend, why are they so anxious to hold them? If authors are sufficiently paid now, and would not be better satisfied with

possessing their own property than with being robbed of it, why do not authors say so? If it be true that in purchasing a work booksellers would in the vast majority of cases give no more for a copyright of sixty years, than for one of thirty years, it follows that they would give *as much* for one of thirty years as for one of sixty years, and authors would sell their copyrights for thirty years. Allowing full force to their assertion that *so few* books pay the expenses of publication, we cannot admit that *no* books are profitable. Well, in those instances, be they twenty, or be they 200 in a year, authors would have the benefit. Are we to be told that because the copyright of forty-nine books in fifty is worth nothing after thirty years, therefore the remaining *one* is worth nothing? Are we to be told that because only one book in a hundred is profitable, therefore *none* are profitable? Yet this is the meaning of the argument brought forward, if it has any meaning at all. If all they intend to convey is, that there would still be many authors who would not find their copyrights valuable at the end of thirty years, we say, no one ever supposed that it would be otherwise. But if they mean to insinuate that *no* authors would find their copyrights valuable after that time, we deny it. And yet if they do not mean this, their argument is worthless.

The retrospective part of Mr. Talfourd's Bill, which proposes that the copyrights in books already assigned, shall, after the expiration of the twenty-eight years, return to the representative of the author for the sixty years, or the remainder of that time from his death, has been objected to by some who are favourable to the general tenour of the Bill. But there seems to be no injustice in this provision, because, as Mr. Talfourd observes, the assignee is entitled in justice only to that for which he contracted and paid. He bargained only for a twenty-eight years term at the outside, and therefore he *can* have no claim beyond that time.

Mr. Serjeant Talfourd's speech is an eloquent and unanswerable statement of the principles of the proposed measure. Three of the most eminent writers of the day, Southey, Wordsworth, and Moore, have expressed their opinions on it, and their cordial concurrence in its object. We know not how we can conclude our observations better than by quoting the learned Serjeant's splendid panegyric on Wordsworth. After speaking of the curious adaptation of the present law to encourage light and frivolous works, but its palpable insufficiency for the claims of a high and enduring literature, he says—

‘ Let us suppose an author of true original genius, disgusted with the inane phraseology which had usurped the place of poetry, and devoting himself from youth to its service, disdaining the gauds which attract the careless and unskilled in the moving accidents of fortune—

not seeking to triumph in the tempest of the passions, but in the serenity which lies above them—whose works shall be scoffed at—whose name made a bye-word—and yet who shall persevere in his high and holy course, gradually impressing thoughtful minds with the sense of truth made visible in the severest forms of beauty, until he shall create the taste by which he shall be appreciated—influence, one after another, the master-spirits of the age—be felt pervading every part of the national literature, softening, raising, and enriching it; and when at last he shall find his confidence in his own aspirations justified, and the name which once was the scorn admitted to be the glory of his age—he shall look forward to the close of his earthly career, as the event which shall consecrate his fame and deprive his children of the opening harvest he is beginning to reap. As soon as his copyright becomes valuable it is gone! This is no ordinary case. I refer to one who, ‘in this setting part of time,’ has opened a vein of the deepest sentiment and thought unknown—who has supplied the noblest antidote to the freezing effects of the scientific spirit of the age—who, while he has detected that poetry which is the essence of the greatest things, has cast a glory around the lowliest conditions of humanity, and traced out the subtle links, by which they are connected with the highest—of one whose name will now find an echo, not only in the heart of the secluded student, but in that of the busiest of those who are fevered by political controversy—of William Wordsworth. Ought we not to requite such a poet in some degree for the injustice of our boyhood? For those works, which are now insensibly quoted by our most popular writers, the spirit of which now mingles with our intellectual atmosphere, he has probably not received through the long life he has devoted to his art, until lately, as much as the same labour, with moderate talent, might justly produce in a single year. Shall the law, whose term has been amply sufficient to his scorers, now afford him no protection because he has out-lastcd their scoffs, because his fame has been fostered amidst the storms, and is now the growth, of years?’—p. 13.

Art. VI. 1. *Acts of Congress.* 1834.

2. *The Book of the Indians of North America.* By SAMUEL G. DRAKE. Boston: 8vo. Seventh Edition. 1837.

3. *State Papers. Indians.* Washington: 2 vols. folio, 1832—1834.

4. *Annual Report of the Commission of Indian Affairs.* Washington, 1836.

5. *Bill to provide for the Security and Protection of the Emigrant and other Indians West of the States of Missouri and Arkansas.* Washington. December, 1837.

THE attempts which are making to protect and elevate the coloured races, are among the most remarkable characteristics of the age; and the good spirit, which prompts these attempts both in favour of the slave, and of the free aboriginal inhabitants

of the colonies, not only manifests itself powerfully in England, but is sensibly influencing countries heretofore the almost hopeless scenes of oppression to both. In Britain public opinion is nearly settled in a way not to be misunderstood by the most careless, and with claims that admit of no compromise;—*elsewhere* the prospect of coming change—in this great chapter of human relations is in a high degree cheering, and chiefly so to those who estimate best the means indispensable for effecting what still remains to be accomplished for the colored race. Improvement in policy is promised even among the Portuguese whose early prosperity in new countries, only the more fatally generated a proportionate degree of corruption; and whose later mischievous policy alone it was, that ruined their once splendid colonial empire along ten thousand leagues of coast, and in the heart of three continents. An able Portuguese minister has already induced his young sovereign to pledge herself to the abandonment of this evil policy; and reverting with just pride to periods when better principles prevailed in the councils of his country, he has entered upon a new colonial career, as vigorously as the perplexed state of affairs at home permits.*

But it is the partially good effort, making by the government of the United States of North America in regard to one race of coloured people, *the Indians*, that we intend, especially, to examine in the present article. Without underrating the enormous evil done them by the American citizens, in common with all other white people who have colonized the New World, our object will be to explain the gigantic measures actually in progress for the purpose of forming a civilized people—out of broken tribes, in the Indian territory of the United States in the west. The magnitude of this scheme may be estimated by its money cost, which is more than one million sterling annually, expended in carrying it into effect. During upwards of fourteen years past, some of the ablest statesmen in America have laboured earnestly to establish its principle and work out its details.

Unfortunately for the honour of the United States, the new system is connected (although, not necessarily), with the frightful principle of REMOVING† many thousands of the Indians from their ancient homes; and if the necessity that is pleaded for this step is traceable to two centuries' abuses permitted by England in her

* By a decree of the 12th of December, 1836, the Queen of Portugal appoints a commission for the reform of the administration of the colonies. This reform was begun by the Cortes of 1826. The minister Viscount Bandedeira Sa, who countersigned the new decree, published in 1831 an excellent paper on the subject.

† Our own government has sanctioned the *removal* principle in its worst extent in Van Dieman's Land, and in Canada. In the latter colony within two years, it has been applied in the most scandalous manner.

Indian administration, it cannot be denied, that to the American people now, as to the British colonists in former days, must justly be imputed a large share of the fault. But as the American government, with its independence, received from Great Britain all its Indian relations embittered by those abuses of two centuries, the Indian administration of the old colonies must share largely in the reproach often levelled too exclusively against their successors.

Before the war of independence, the conduct of the English towards the Indians of North America, resembled that of all Europeans to the natives of other barbarous countries. The home government, whilst professing a wish to protect and civilize them, acted in utter disregard of its profession. The colonial laws rendered the defence of their rights, and the redress of their individual grievances, impossible. Their possessions were intruded upon without ceasing. Our most vicious propensities were transferred to them without check. Our diseases were introduced among them without an attempt at prevention, or cure,—without the slightest aid to their helplessness against the fatal visitation. The benevolent efforts of sincere friends to improve them—efforts that were almost always met by corresponding advance on their parts in the slow march of civilization—were often misdirected, and always on too small a scale. These *errors of friends* have not been enough considered as they should be, along with the ordinary reproaches rightly cast on those who have either neglected or outraged the Indians. And they are the more important, as at present, both in the United States, and in this country many friends of the same cause are falling into the same errors. William Penn, an incomparable man for his time, whom puny cavillers will attack in vain,—tolerant, courteous, kind, and substantially just,—even William Penn neglected the most important guarantees for his poor people, who were, at last, driven from the lands which gave his descendants princely revenues; and those descendants were enabled by his neglect of proper guarantees to enjoy those revenues almost unburthened by every charge that ought to have been perpetual in favour of the aboriginal lords of the soil. They could get no justice in his courts; for they were not admissible as witnesses, although this was a grievance of which the members of his own sect obtained the abolition for themselves in Pennsylvania. Nor did he establish a single suitable means to elevate the condition of the Indians either moral, or social, so that they might bear the change of all about them, and gradually become their own protectors. The admirable missionaries too, Elliot, and Mayhew, although as efficient in their most important calling as any of their fellows of any age, or country, fell into equally fatal mistakes,—holding that the improving Indians ought to be kept in a state of seclusion. Con-

sequently, as they did not learn gradually to cope with civilized man in his early advances, they were altogether incapable of resisting his overwhelming progress, and therefore were destroyed by the contact from which no human power can entirely shelter them. Something like this error contributed to the ruin of the Jesuits' mission in Paraguay, and, in our own times, there is a tendency we fear among some English missionaries to fall into it.

Bishop Berkeley wasted his great powers in one vast undertaking for the benefit of the Indians, in consequence of his easy faith in a government that deluded him by half a dozen years of false promises and evasions, and then left him for as many more years to struggle against the pecuniary difficulties to which they exposed him. The minister, Walpole, who had consented to Berkeley's plan for improving the Indians, excused himself, by saying, 'that he should *not* have acquiesced in it, if not convinced that parliament would refuse its support.' Berkeley erred too, in considering that literary education alone would civilize a barbarous people.

Other eminent individuals devoted great zeal and great talents to the improvement of the Indians before the independence of the United States; but upon no *system* that fairly met the many difficulties of the case. It was, *also*, in those days, a great obstacle to the civilization of the native tribes, that the conflicting politics of the French and English, prompted both to excite these tribes to take part in wars which involved no interests of their own, aggravated all their mischievous passions, and sunk them in the melancholy degradation, with rare intervals of excitement.

The result is too well known. The whole range of the eastern colonies from Massachusetts to Georgia, was stripped of its multitudinous tribes seventy years ago, with the exception of a few scattered remnants, which had marvellously withstood our blood-hounds, our gunpowder, our ardent spirits, our diseases, and our frauds, to prove how difficult of accomplishment is the cruel work of destroying human beings.

Yet do we hear every day of these tribes, '*melting away like snow before the sun*;' and other more material metaphors; as if the suffering,—the mortal suffering of body and mind of hundreds of thousands of these poor creatures were not the essence of the frightful operation. Historical details that may safely be submitted to rigorous scrutiny, prove too that all degrees of improvement were attained by Indians long before the independence of the old colonies; and an able statesman of the revolution, and one of the bravest of its generals, Knox, then declared, that it was '*more convenient than just*,' to deny their capability of civilization.

Washington, when employed as a colonial officer, before the war, had exhibited sound and benevolent views in regard to them; and as President of the United States, he struggled hard to overcome the difficulties of the whole question. He earnestly appealed to their chiefs in order to convince them of the advantages of civilization, without sharing which, said he to them, in a solemn council, *your fate is sealed, and your people will sink miserably before the white men.* He succeeded, with the aid of the Moravian Missionaries, in laying the foundation of the improvement of the Creeks and Cherokees. But the old systems of trading, although modified, were not placed on a satisfactory footing; and no system either to regulate *squatters*, or to redress Indian grievances, was devised long after the time of Washington. The administration of law continued to be what it is still, a means of sheltering the oppressor, and of overwhelming the oppressed. One defect of the law itself has been already noticed, namely, the incompetency of Indian witnesses, who cannot take oaths. Its importance is obvious; and the following passage, from a book printed in the United States only last year, proves indisputably that this cruel rule of a bigotted code is not only in force, but that it is used in the most Machiavelian manner, in order to strip the Indians of their lands. The case occurred in 1834, the year before the breaking out of the Florida war, which is still raging with a degree of obstinacy that is sufficiently explained by this extract. We copy so much of the American author as will show the causes of the war, and some working of the *removal* system; which is the *bad* part of the great scheme that is the subject of our article.

The length of this and other extracts will be excused, in consideration of the rareness of the books and documents quoted, and of the importance of the matter to a race of men now standing on the brink between life and death.

‘When we are told,’ says our author, ‘that at such a time, and such a place, commissioners of the United States government met a delegation of the principal chiefs of the Southern Indians, and made a treaty, the articles of which were satisfactory to the Indians, two or three queries present themselves for solution; as, by what means have the chiefs been got together? what other chiefs and principal men are there belonging to such a nation, who *did not* participate in the business of the treaty? Anxious to effect their object, commissioners have sometimes practised unwarrantable means to obtain it; especially in encouraging sales of territory by a minority of chiefs, or gaining their consent to a removal by presents.

* * * * *

‘Shortly after the cession, [of Florida to the U. S.] a treaty was made by which the Seminoles consented to relinquish by far the better part of their lands, and retire to the centre of the peninsula,—a quarter

consisting for the most part of pine barrens of the worst description, and terminating towards the south in unexplored and impassable marshes. When the time came for the execution of the treaty, old Neha Mathla, the head of the tribe, thought it savored too much of the cunning and whiskey of the white man, and summoned his warriors to resist it. Gov. Duval, who succeeded Gen. Jackson in the chief magistracy of this territory, broke in upon his war council, deposed the war leaders, and elevated the peace party to the chieftaincies. The Seminoles retired peaceably to the territory assigned them, and old Neha Mathla retired to the Creeks, by whom he was raised to the dignity of a chief.

‘The next event of considerable moment in the history of the Seminoles, is the treaty of Payne’s Landing. Of this affair I am able to speak in the language of the principal agent in it, on the part of the whites. The individual to whom I refer, General Wiley Thompson, will be particularly noticed hereafter, from the melancholy fate which he met in the progress of this war.

‘I have, in a previous chapter, spoken of the treaty at Moultrie Creek; but, before going into the particulars of that at Payne’s Landing, it will be necessary to make a few additional observations. The Indians who consented to that treaty, by such consent agreed ‘to come under the protection of the United States, to give up their possessions, and remove to certain restricted boundaries in the territory, the extreme point of which was not to be nearer than fifteen miles to the sea coast of the Gulf of Mexico. For any losses to which they might be subjected by their removal, the government agreed to make liberal donations, also to provide implements of husbandry, schools, &c., and pay an annuity of 5000 dollars for twenty years; besides which, there were presents of corn, meat, &c., &c. It was required of the Indians that they should prevent absconding slaves from taking refuge among them, and they were to use all proper exertions to apprehend and deliver the same to their proper owners.’

‘Our account next goes on to state, that the harmony which existed at the conclusion of this treaty was very great, and that the Indians were so well satisfied with its provisions, ‘that they had a clause expressly inserted, by which the United States agent, Major Gad. Humphreys, and the interpreter, Richards, were to have each one mile square, in fee simple, as a mark of the confidence they reposed in these officers of the government.’

‘Before this treaty was carried into effect, the Indians were intruded upon, and they gradually began to be rather slow in the delivery of the runaway negroes.’ Clamors were therefore loud against them, and difficulties followed, in quick succession, for several years. At length it was determined that the Seminoles should be, somehow or other, got out of Florida, and the treaty of Payne’s Landing was got up for this object.

‘Accordingly, in 1832, on the 9th of May, a treaty was entered into ‘on Ocklawaha River, known by the name of the treaty of Payne’s Landing, by which they stipulated to relinquish all their possessions in Florida, and emigrate to the country allotted to the Creeks, west of the

Mississippi ; in consideration of which the government was to pay 15,400 dollars, on their arrival at their new home ; and give to each of the warriors' women and children, one blanket and one homespun frock. The whole removal was stipulated to take place within three years after the ratification.'

'What object the government could have had in view by stipulating that the Indians should deliver into its hands all their cattle and horses, previous to their emigration, I know not, unless it was the intention of its agents to *speculate in stock* ; or perhaps the mode by which the Indians were to be transported, would not admit of their being transported with them. Be this as it might, we shall see that this stock affair was among the beginning of the sparks of war.

'It appears that between 1832 and 1834, it had become very apparent that no removal was intended by the Indians ; and it was equally apparent that those who had engaged a removal for the nation, were not the first people in it,—and, consequently, a difficulty would ensue, let the matter be urged when it would. General Thompson was the government agent in Florida, and he (whether with advice or without, I am not informed) thought it best to have a talk with some of the real head men of the nation, upon the subject of removal, which he effected about a year before the time of removal expired, namely, in the fall of 1834.

'Meanwhile, the chief who had been put in the place of Neamathla, by Governor Duval, had been executed, by some of the nation, for adhering to the whites, and advocating a removal beyond the Mississippi. The name of the chief executed upon this account was Hicks. To him succeeded one named Charles, or, as he is sometimes called, Charles Omathla, and he shared the same fate not long after. Nine warriors came into his council, and learning that he insisted upon a removal, shot nine bullets through his heart ! No more doubtful characters were now raised to the chieftaincy, but a warrior, named Louis, well known for his hostility to the whites, was made chief.

'In the council which General Thompson got together for the purpose of holding a talk, as has been remarked, appeared Osceola, and several other distinguished chiefs. This council was held at Fort King, and was opened by Gen. Thompson in a considerable speech, wherein he endeavoured to convict the Indians of the necessity of a speedy removal ; urging, at the same time, that their own safety, as well as that of their property, required it ; and requested their answer to the subject of his discourse, which he presented in form of propositions. 'The Indians retired to private council, to discuss the subject, when the present young and daring chief Aceola (Powell) [Osceola] addressed the council, in an animated strain, against emigration, and said that any one who should dare to recommend it should be looked upon as an enemy, and held responsible to the nation. There was something in his manner so impressive and bold, that it alarmed the timid of the council ; and it was agreed, in private talk, that the treaty should be resisted. *When this was made known to the agent, he made them a long and eloquent harangue, setting forth the dangers that surrounded them if they were subjected to the laws of the pale faces, where a red man's*

word would not be taken ; that the whites might make false charges against them, and deprive them of their negroes, horses, lands, &c. All this time Osceola was sitting by, begging the chiefs to remain firm.' —*Drake's Indians of North America*, Book IV., Chap. VIII., pp. 70—72.

The treaty was, however, at length got from the Indians ; and the war thus provoked is unhesitatingly declared by the American author, as it has been denounced even in Congress, to be unjust. The agent, General Thompson, fell in it—shot by fifteen bullets. Osceola has since died ; a prisoner, taken under circumstances which have been harshly characterized. Five Generals of the United States have been baffled in successive campaigns in this Seminole country ; the war has already cost four millions sterling, with hundreds of white men's lives ; and the last intelligence from America is, that the present commander has urgently recommended to the government to give up the contest, and let these poor people remain in their 'pine barrens,' and pestilential swamps, which they now hold against an army of 8000 men.

The scheme, which such a termination of this particular contest, and *a few others like it*, would little impede, aims in its better part, at establishing a system that shall abolish the ordinary occasions of these unhappy conflicts. The character of the scheme itself may be collected from the details contained in the following abridgment of the Annual Report of the Commissioner of Indian Affairs for 1836.

'The Act of Congress, of May 28, 1830, provided for an exchange of lands with the Indians residing in any of the States or Territories east of the Mississippi, and for their removal beyond that river. It authorized the President 'solemnly to assure the tribe or nation with which the exchange is made, that the United States will for ever secure and guarantee to them, their heirs and successors, the country so exchanged with them.' It further authorized him 'to cause such tribe or nation to be protected at their new residence, against all interruption or disturbance from any other tribe or nation of Indians, or from any other person or persons whatever.' It also empowered him to exercise over them 'the same superintendence and care,' that he had extended to them before their removal.

'Anterior to the passage of this Act, which devolved upon the Executive these high duties to the Indian tribes, the necessity of some form of government had been distinctly recognized. Stipulations were made in treaties with the Cherokees and Choctaws, for their removal and settlement west of the Mississippi, in 1817 and 1820. In 1824, Mr. Monroe, in his message at the opening of the Session, pointed to the vast extent of country 'between the limits of our present States and Territories, and the Rocky Mountains and Mexico,' as a region to which the Indians 'might be invited, with inducements which might

be successful. 'It is thought,' he observed, 'if that territory should be divided into districts, by previous agreement with the tribes now residing there, and civil governments be established in each, with schools for every branch of instruction in literature and in the arts of civilized life, that all the tribes now within our limits might gradually be drawn there.' On the 16th of December, 1824, the Committee on Indian Affairs was instructed, by a resolution of the House of Representatives, 'to inquire into the expediency of organizing all the Territories of the United States, lying west of the State of Missouri and Territories of Arkansas and Michigan, into a separate Territory, to be occupied exclusively by the Indians; and of authorizing the President of the United States to adopt such measures as he may think best, to colonize all the Indians of the present States and Territories permanently within the same.' On the 27th of January, 1825, Mr. Monroe again presented this subject to the House of Representatives, in a special message. 'The great object to be accomplished,' he said, 'is the removal of these tribes to the territory designated, on conditions which shall be satisfactory to themselves and honourable to the United States. This can be done only by conveying to each tribe a good title to an adequate portion of land, to which it may consent to remove, and by providing for it there a system of internal government, which shall protect their property from invasion, and by the regular progress of improvement and civilization, prevent that degeneracy which has generally marked the transition from the one to the other state.' 'The digest of such a government, with the consent of the Indians, which should be endowed with sufficient powers to meet all the objects contemplated: to connect the several tribes together in a bond of amity, and preserve order in each; to prevent intrusions on their property; to teach them, by regular instruction, the arts of civilized life, and make them a civilized people, is an object of very high importance. It is the powerful consideration which we have to offer to these tribes, as an inducement to relinquish the lands on which they now reside, and to remove to those which are designated.' 'To the United States, the proposed arrangement offers many important advantages, in addition to those which have been already enumerated. By the establishment of such a government over these tribes, with their consent, we become in reality their benefactors. The relation of conflicting interests, which has heretofore existed between them and our frontier settlements, will cease. There will be no more wars between them and the United States. Adopting such a government, their movement will be in harmony with us, and its good effects be felt through the whole extent of our territory to the Pacific. It may fairly be presumed that, through the agency of such a government, the condition of all the tribes inhabiting that vast region may be essentially improved; that permanent peace may be preserved with them, and our commerce be much extended.'

* * * *

'These official papers look to the removal, permanent settlement, and protection of the Indians, and the establishment of a Territorial Government as measures of vital importance to them, and demanded by

a just regard to the obligations of the United States. The treaty with the Cherokees of May 6, 1828, may be considered as the first formal recognition of and action upon these principles, as it secured to them a permanent home under the most solemn guaranty of the United States, that it should remain theirs for ever, and stipulated that the United States would give them a set of plain laws, and cause their lands to be laid off, whenever they wished to own them individually.

‘In the message at the opening of the 1st Session of the Twenty-first Congress, President Jackson suggested ‘the propriety of setting apart an ample district west of the Mississippi, and without the limits of any State or Territory now formed, to be guaranteed to the Indian tribes, as long as they shall occupy it; each tribe having a distinct control over the portion designated for its use.’ ‘There,’ he observed, ‘they may be secured in the enjoyment of governments of their own choice, subject to no other control from the United States, than such as may be necessary to preserve peace on the frontier and between the several tribes.’ In the Report of the Department of War, which accompanied this message, Mr. Eaton remarked, ‘no better plan can be thought of, than that the United States shall put in operation such a system of Indian protection and government, west of the Mississippi, as that a confidence may be reposed that they are indeed our fostered children, and the Government not only so disposed to consider, but practically to evince their good feelings towards them. At present an objection arises with the weaker tribes. They are indisposed to emigrate, from an apprehension that powerful and stronger neighbours may oppress them, and that no surer protection can be obtained from the United States in the west, than is possessed already where they reside. To remove such apprehensions will be of importance.

‘I beg leave to suggest for your consideration, if an Indian territory, without the range of western States and Territories, might not be advantageously created; to give efficiency and to inspire confidence, military posts, under some able and discreet officer of the army, to be designated at some central and convenient point. Intrusions from the whites might thus be restrained, and the Indians maintained in quiet with each other. Laws for their general government and to preserve peace amongst the tribes, to be the act of the United States, with a right to the Indians in council to make their own municipal regulations.’

‘The Act of Congress of May 28, 1830, was the authoritative sanction of both branches of the National Legislature to the suggestion of the President. Numerous treaties for the cession and exchange of lands have since been made with Indian tribes; and the entire number of many of them, and portions of others, have been removed. From a want of exact knowledge of the topography of the country, errors were made in defining the boundaries of the lands intended to be assigned to them, and questions arose which remained long unsettled, and proved to be of difficult adjustment. The relations between the indigenous and emigrated tribes were of novel character, and the establishment of them upon an amicable basis was evidently of great importance to them and to our own citizens. These considerations were presented

to Congress in a Report from this department to the President, dated February 16, 1832, which was transmitted to that Body on the same day. Approving the measure recommended at the close of that Report, Congress passed the Act of July 14, 1832, providing '*for the appointment of three commissioners to treat with the Indians, and for other purposes.*'

* * * *

'By the Bill of 1834, it was 'made competent for the council of confederated tribes to elect, in such manner as the general council may prescribe, a delegate to Congress, who shall have the same power, privileges, and compensation as are possessed by the delegates of the respective territories.' In the Bill of 1836, the phraseology in reference to this subject was changed, so as to provide for the residence of a delegate 'at the seat of Government during the session of Congress, who shall be entitled to the same compensation as that of a delegate from a territory.' The terms of the first Bill conform most nearly to the views of the Indians themselves, so far as they have at any time been made known. The Choctaws, in the 22nd Article of the Treaty of September 27, 1830, and the Cherokees, in the 7th Article of the Treaty of December 29, 1835, expressed a solicitude that they might have the privilege of a delegate on the floor of the House of Representatives. These treaties having been ratified without any exception being taken to these articles, may it not be assumed that Congress intended, whenever it was determined that this measure was proper, to accede to the requests of these tribes, to the extent, and in the manner they themselves desired?

'It is worthy of remark, that the proposition, to admit a delegate from the Indians to a seat in the national council, was first made to them by the United States, during the war of the revolution. In the 6th Article of the Treaty with the Delawares, of September 17, 1778, 'it is further agreed on between the contracting parties, (should it for the future be found conducive for the mutual interests of both parties,) to invite any other tribes, who have been friends to the interest of the United States, to join the present confederation, and to form a State, whereof the Delaware nation shall be the head, and have a representation in Congress.' It is apparent from the preceding part of the section, that the object was to obviate the *false suggestions of the enemies of the United States*, who had 'endeavoured, by every artifice in their power, to possess the Indians in general with an opinion, that it was the design of the States to extirpate the Indians, and take possession of their country.' In addition to the conciliatory influence of the measure, it has, at the present day, additional importance from the increased extent of our Indian relations, and the increased capacity of the Indians themselves to afford information, that will be useful in the preparation of the laws affecting them.

* * * *

'The Act of May 28, 1830, gave to this matter a new character. It distinctly authorized treaties for the exchange and cession of lands, the conveyance in fee of equivalent tracts to the Indians, and the extension to them, at all times, of adequate protection. Since its passage, the

current of emigration has been constantly flowing, with different degrees of rapidity at different times. More liberal arrangements have been made, in treaties, for the supply of the wants of the Indians, and the promotion of their comfort. The stipulations made with the Choctaws in 1830, provided reservations of land, large annuities, means for education, churches, agricultural and mechanical establishments, and ample donations of blankets, rifles and agricultural implements. The stipulations in subsequent treaties with other tribes have conformed to these, the amounts and quantities being, of course, proportioned to the numbers of the Indians with whom they were made. As a natural result, the emigrated tribes, having these advantages and facilities, have acquired property, and with property a feeling of independence and self-respect, and a desire to advance in civilization. This has been especially the case with the Choctaws, Creeks, and Cherokees, the three largest tribes within the limits of the proposed territory, as these were described in the two Bills reported to the House of Representatives. The acting Superintendent of Indian Affairs, in compliance with a circular from this office, has made a very valuable and sensible report, abounding in facts illustrative of the prosperous condition of these people. I have collated some of them, as the happy condition of things which they exhibit, forms one of the arguments, upon which the expediency of establishing a government, competent to afford security and protection, may be rested.

‘It is a source of serious gratitude,’ he observes, speaking of the Choctaws, ‘to witness their gradual improvement.’ They are governed by a written constitution, and have an annual general council, to which twenty-seven members are elected, who are paid out of the annuity, and who pass such laws as they think proper. The three chiefs of the nation meet with the council, any two of whom can exercise the veto power; but if a Bill be again passed by two-thirds of the council, it becomes a law. Their laws are reduced to writing, and copies of them, and of the constitution, are left with the agent. A new council-house and houses for their chiefs are in process of construction. The middle country, between the Arkansas and the Red Rivers, Blue Boggy and the Canadian, is particularly fitted for raising stock. The Red River part is destined soon to be a fine cotton-growing country; the native traders have erected cotton gins, and they purchase all the cotton that is raised by the common Indians and half breeds. It is estimated that about 500 bales will go down Red River, from the Choctaws, this year. There is one good grist and saw-mill near Red River, and another is building on the Poteau, from which large quantities of lumber will go down the Arkansas. To a great extent the trade with these Indians is carried on by the natives. ‘I can state, from my own knowledge, that two native Choctaws on Red River have this year brought into the country 20,000 dollars worth of goods; and there are others engaged in smaller trade of from 2000 to 10,000 dollars. They make their purchases in New Orleans, and, I understand, are in good credit.’ The assistants in the three public smith-shops are natives, who, in a year or two, will be able to take charge of them. Besides these shops they have five others of their own, that are used in the

farming season. 'The chase, for a living, is now nearly abandoned ; many take a fall hunt, but it is more an excursion of pleasure than a pursuit of gain.'

'Of the Cherokees,' he says, 'they are gradually progressing in civilization and the cultivation of the soil, and amongst them are many intelligent men. They raise corn, beef, pork, sheep, &c., to a considerable extent, and in travelling through their country you are quite comfortably entertained. Many of them are engaged in trade with their own people ; they are, however, not located advantageously for the cultivation of cotton. They have some mills erected amongst them ; and with a wide extent of country, a portion of it finely watered, they bid fair, with frugality and temperance, to become a leading tribe.' A similar account of these Indians was given by the commissioners in 1834, and they stated, besides, that a government had been organized by them, laws ordained, and enforced by a body of sheriffs, termed light horse.

'The Creeks,' continues the acting superintendent, 'have a rich country, and those of them that emigrated with M'Intosh have been engaged busily in making corn ; they usually have a large surplus, as high some years as 30,000 bushels, besides stock of every description. As there is now a large emigration coming to the country, they will find a sale for all they may have to sell. They have not yet engaged in trade.'

'In another communication, he mentions that there are seventeen churches within the limits of these three tribes : ten in the Choctaw, four in the Cherokee, and three in the Creek country.

* * * *

'The obligations which the United States have assumed in their negotiations with some of these Indians, and in their legislation in regard to them, have no inconsiderable bearing upon this matter of protection and government. With the largest of the emigrated tribes, the Choctaws, Creeks, and Cherokees, the United States have made treaties containing stipulations, which bind them to secure to these Indians 'the jurisdiction and government of all the persons and property that may be within their limits west.' This language is quoted from the fourth article of the treaty with the Choctaws, of September 27, 1830. The fourteenth article of the treaty with the Creeks, of March 24, 1832, and the fifth article of the treaty with the Cherokees, of December 29, 1835, secure to those tribes similar powers. By the twenty-fifth section of the Intercourse Act of 1834, it is prescribed, 'that so much of the laws of the United States, as provides for the punishment of crimes committed within any place within the sole and exclusive jurisdiction of the United States, shall be in force in the Indian country : Provided, The same shall not extend to crimes committed by one Indian against the person and property of another Indian.' Thus the right to form and administer all laws is solemnly guaranteed to these Indians. And it is stated by General Stokes, the agent for the Cherokees, that they 'are in the habit of making written wills, deeds of gift, bills of sale, written judgments of their courts, written judgments of arbitration, and written settlements of the es-

ates of deceased persons.' The relations of debtor and creditor between the native and the native trader, and between the latter and our own citizens, now becoming important in extent and amount, are also to be regulated and guarded by them.'—pp. 6—16.

The Indian *territory* which is the subject of this report, contains upwards of 60,000,000 of acres, of which the removed tribes have already had 32,000,000 assigned to them. The residue are to be assigned to the remaining tribes, or belong to the Indians already on those lands. The number of emigrants in 1836, was 45,690; the number of the Indians still within the limits of the States, was 57,333; the number of the indigenous tribes, was 150,000. The expense incurred in removing the emigrants was £16,000,000 sterling. The quantity of lands within the limits of the States required by the government under the removal treaties, is 93,000,000 of acres, which must far exceed the expense of the scheme. The state of education and religious instruction among the Indians is described as being imperfectly known. But it is asserted in the report already quoted, that the tribes, generally, strongly desire education for their children. The best instructed tribes, the Choctaws, have 391 pupils at the smaller schools under twenty teachers, of whom five are Indians. These twenty smaller schools are supported, twelve by the American Missionary Society, three by the United States under treaty, and five by the Choctaw nation itself; sixty-seven Choctaw students, besides eighty-nine other Indians, are, also, at a remarkable academy in Kentucky, managed by the Baptists. The eighty-nine belong to eight other tribes, one of which is the unfortunate Seminoles. Four Indians, also, are students at law. The schools among the Choctaws are favorite institutions with them, and under the teaching of competent men, and the supervision agent, have produced and are producing essential benefits. The Shawnees and Delawares, so well known to the readers of the Moravian Missionaries' history, have been improved by the labours of instructors long established among them. Minor scholastic institutions exist in their infancy among three other remote tribes, who regard them with favour. In all these establishments, instruction in manual mechanical arts and in agriculture is combined with intellectual culture; and there is an increasing disposition among the Indians to have them located in their own country, where they are said to become objects of common feeling and interest.

These institutions are supported partly by sums stipulated for in treaties between the United States and the Indians; partly by voluntary Missionary Societies, partly by the tribes themselves; and partly by an annual grant of Congress paid over to the missionaries. A portion of the annual grant, called for many years the *civilization fund*, and amounting to £2500 a-year, is chiefly

expended in these institutions among Indians on the remote frontier, where no other provision is yet made for the same purpose. Upon this head it is an interesting fact, that the small remnants of three tribes, now united emigrants in the new territory, and amounting only to 1800 souls, have appropriated by their treaty of sale of their old lands in the state of Illinois, the sum £20,000 out of the price as 'a perpetual fund for education and 'the encouragement of the domestic arts,' under the management of the president of the United States, and with a proviso that the Indian confederates shall manage this fund, when 'sufficiently enlightened' to be entrusted with it. The period of their sufficient advancement is to be declared by the president and senate of the United States.*

The treaty having appropriation, is one of those to which the severe reproach of the American author above quoted, is not applicable. By this treaty, the Indians sold to the United States 5,000,000 of acres along the western shore of Lake Michigan, taking for that land 5,000,000 west of the Mississippi, part of the new territory; with £60,000 in money; £3,500 a-year for twenty years; £25,000 in goods; £40,000 to be expended in 'mills, farm-houses, Indians' houses, blacksmiths' shops, agricultural improvements, implements, and stock; and for the support of such medical men, millers, farmers, blacksmiths, and other mechanics' as the president may direct; and the above-mentioned sum of £2000 for instruction.

The provisions for medical aid in the foregoing appropriation of the price of land, relates to a subject which has hitherto received far too little attention. The American Missionary Societies have been the first to apply a considerable correction to past errors on this head; as they are understood to send out their labourers in parties of three families, or individuals, of whom one is always a regularly taught medical practitioner. It does not appear in the document before us, whether the American government has carried out this provision of the treaty, and similar provisions in other treaties, in a suitable manner.

On this, and on numerous other weighty points, this scheme of securing to the Indians lands where they may, at last, be at rest; and, at the same time, of giving them *sufficient means of civilization*, must be applauded, especially, so far as it relates to the remote tribes already settled in their own homes within the territory in question. The attempt to protect, and civilize the native people there, is in its better parts the first that has been made upon a good and extensive plan with those objects in view, by any government.

In order to give a permanent character to this attempt, in December last there was brought into Congress,

* Indian Treatise. Washington, 1837. p. 586.

‘ A Bill to provide for the security and protection of the emigrant and other Indians west of the States of Missouri and Arkansas, of which the 1st section enacts, That the country, beginning at the sources of the Puncah river ; thence, down said river, to Missouri river ; thence, down Missouri river, on the south-west bank, to the State of Missouri ; thence, along the western line of the State of Missouri, to the north-west corner of the State of Arkansas ; thence, along the western boundary of the State of Arkansas, to Red River ; thence, up Red River, to a point 200 miles in a direct course west of the State of Arkansas ; thence, in a direct line, to the beginning, be denominated *the Indian Territory*, and be reserved for the use of the various Indian tribes who have, or may have, a right to the same: *Provided*, That the lands secured to any tribe shall revert to the United States when such tribe shall abandon the same, or become extinct: *Provided, also*, That the United States shall have the right to make military roads through the same, and to occupy a sufficient quantity for military posts, and for the residence of such persons as shall be authorized to reside in the Indian country, in conformity with treaties and the laws of the United States: *And provided, also*, That no white person, either citizen of the United States or of any other country, shall be allowed to reside in the Indian territory, under any pretence whatever, without the authority of the United States.

‘ Section 2, enacts: That a superintendent of Indian affairs, for the said Indian territory, who shall continue in office for the term of four years, with a salary of 2,500 dollars per annum, shall reside in the said Indian territory, and execute such duties as shall be enjoined by law, under such regulations as shall be established by the President, to whom, as often as he shall require it, the said superintendent shall report his proceedings.

‘ Section 3, enacts: That a secretary of said Indian territory, appointed for the term of four years, with an annual salary of 1500 dollars, shall reside at the place appointed for the residence of the superintendent, and keep a record of all the official proceedings of the superintendent, and annually transmit a copy of the same to the President, to be laid before Congress ; and perform the duties of superintendent during the vacancy of such office, or during the absence of the superintendent.

‘ Section 4, enacts: That each of the tribes residing within said Indian territory may establish and maintain such government and laws, for the regulation of their internal concerns, as to them may seem proper, not being contrary to the stipulations contained in any existing treaty with such tribe, or to the laws that have been or may be passed by Congress to regulate trade and intercourse with the Indian tribes.

‘ Section 5, enacts: That the superintendent shall invite the chiefs of the various tribes, or parts of tribes, embraced in this Act, to unite in a general council, for the purpose of forming a confederation, for regulating the intercourse and preserving peace with each other, and for their assent to such of the provisions of this Act as may require their co-operation or assent ; and such articles of confederation and such assent shall not be binding on any tribe unless subsequently

assented to by such tribe in council, or by its delegates duly authorized for that purpose; and duplicates of the articles of confederation, and of such act of assent, shall be made, one of which to be transmitted to the President, and the other retained in the office of the superintendent: *Provided*, That said articles of confederation shall be of no effect until approved by the President; and, if not approved by him, they shall be returned to the superintendent, to be again submitted to the council for such modification as he may think proper: *Provided, further*, That copies of the articles of confederation, that may finally be adopted, shall be laid before Congress at its next session: *And provided further*, That the said confederation may be carried into effect by any number of tribes that may choose thus to unite.

Section 6, enacts: That any of the tribes now within, or that may hereafter emigrate to, said Indian territory, shall be entitled to be admitted into the said confederation on an equal footing with the tribes first assenting thereto.

Section 7, enacts: That after the formation of such confederation, and according to an article to be contained in it, a general council of the tribes composing such confederation shall be annually held, at such place as the superintendent shall appoint, to consist of not more than five, nor less than two, from each tribe, who shall be chosen by their respective tribes, in such ratio, and in such manner, as shall be provided in such articles of confederation. The superintendent shall secure to each member equal privileges, and a majority shall constitute a quorum; and the said council shall have power to make all necessary regulations respecting the intercourse among their tribes, and with other tribes, for the preservation of peace, to put an end to hostilities, and generally to enact such laws as the welfare of the confederation shall demand, and adopt such measures as may be necessary to give effect to this Act, without infringing the rights of the tribes, severally, to manage their own internal concerns; and the members shall receive from the United States their necessary subsistence while attending and returning from the council, until otherwise provided by law: *Provided*, The laws and regulations so passed be not repugnant to the provisions of this Act, nor to the treaties with such tribes, or with any other tribe of Indians; and, to that end, all laws and regulations passed by a majority of the council shall be submitted to the superintendent, and shall have no force until approved by him: *Provided, further*, That said laws and regulations shall be reported by the superintendent to the President of the United States, and shall not take effect until approved by him: *And provided, further*, That a regular journal of the proceedings of the council shall be kept, in the English language, and certified by the superintendent, and copies thereof be printed, at the close of each session, for each tribe, for the Superintendent, Secretary, the Office of Indian Affairs, the Committees on Indian Affairs in the Senate and House of Representatives, and the library of Congress.

Section 8. And to promote the advancement of such confederated tribes in the science of civil government, to afford them a convincing proof of the desire of the United States that they may be secured the enjoyment of the benefit of free government, and to enable them at

all times to represent their condition to the Government, *It is enacted, That such confederated tribes, or their general council, may elect, in such manner as the President of the United States shall direct, a delegate to reside at the seat of Government during each session of Congress, who shall be of Indian descent, and an acknowledged member of an Indian tribe, and who shall be entitled to the same compensation as that of a member of Congress: Provided, That the council may, after the two first years, enact laws prescribing the mode of such election; which laws shall be approved by the President of the United States before they take effect.*

‘Section 9, enacts: That all persons employed under treaty stipulations, and all persons travelling in or through said Indian territory, not being residents therein, shall be under the protection of, and subject to, the laws of the United States; and if any such person shall, within said Indian territory, commit any offence against the laws of the United States, it shall be the duty of the superintendent to cause such persons to be apprehended, and removed for trial to the judicial district having jurisdiction of such offence.

‘Section 10, enacts: That, for the purpose of carrying this Act into effect, all that part of the said Indian territory that lies south of the north line of the lands assigned to the Osage tribe of Indians, shall be, and hereby is, annexed to the judicial district of Arkansas; and that all that part of said territory that lies north of said line shall be, and is hereby, annexed to the judicial district of Missouri.’

The success of this better part of the new system, is, however, seriously endangered by two errors unworthy of an enlightened and humane people.

In the first place, to say nothing of the extreme sufferings attendant on the emigration of large bodies of people, when not consoled by the feeling that they are free agents seeking to better their condition, the forcing men in any state of society to quit their homes, is a wrong not to be compensated by even great possible benefit; and it is an abuse of language to say, that many of the *removal* treaties of the Indians with the United States, have been free acts on the part of the tribes. The will of every man of them, therefore, who is reluctant to leave his ancient home, ought to be respected, and every vestige of compulsion erased from the whole system. It is the more reasonable to require this modification in it, inasmuch as its better parts, namely, *its good civilizing institutions in the new territory*, with the extension of missions, and other aids now in preparation, will make it abundantly attractive; as, indeed, it is already proved to be by the fact of a large body of Upper Canadian Indians having voluntarily abandoned their lands under the British government in order to go to the West.

There is another motive for pausing in this project of removing so many people, unwilling to exchange their ancient homes for the new country. This is, the fear of their resentment;

and the ordinary intelligence of the day from Washington on the subject proves, that the dangers of hostility on the part of the United Indians, are not unnoticed in the States; as will be seen from the following remarks, on the present state of Indian affairs :

‘ The rejection by Congress of the memorial of the Cherokees against being compelled to emigrate, has created so much dissatisfaction among them, that troops are sent to their country. Further Indian troubles may, also, be anticipated on the Missouri frontier, where a band of starving Osages having applied to some *settlers* to *BUY* food, were refused. A collision was the consequence, and several whites were killed.

‘ The Florida war has cost many millions, and now employs an army of 8000 men, whose exertions hitherto have not been attended with success. The moral effect too of the Seminoles so long withstanding the arms of the republic, might, if known to remote tribes, induce them to make common cause. The Indians, one and all, both by traditions of the wrongs of two centuries, as well as by present suffering, are constantly incited against the whites, as despoilers of their lands. Many experienced statesmen, therefore, in the United States, begin to fear that banishing them all into one particular region, may, in the end, prove impolitic, as the various tribes will constantly communicate with each other, all animated by a principle of enmity against *civilization*. And if a chieftain should arise, crafty, eloquent, ambitious, and war-like,—such, for example, as *Tecumseh*,—it is possible, that he might prevail upon them to unite against the republic. If, under such circumstances, they were to engage in a war of vengeance, the consequences to the border states would be too frightful for contemplation. Although their ultimate subjugation would be inevitable, yet thousands upon thousands of the whites, in such a contest, would be sacrificed to the bullet, the arrow, the tomahawk, the scalping knife, and the burning stake. May heaven avert such a calamity from the people of this land ! and, yet, without the adoption of a firm, humane, and cautious policy towards the Indians, these horrors, to a certain extent, are far from impossible. The unquelling courage, the ferocity, the craft, and perseverance of the North American Indian, together with the cruelties attendant on his savage mode of warfare—his remarkable contempt of danger, pain, and death, render him one of the most dreadful enemies on the face of the earth.’—*Correspondence of the Morning Chronicle from Philadelphia, May 5th, 1838.*

Instead then of the pains now rashly bestowed upon the removal of the broken tribes, amounting to 45,000 souls, the strong powers and resources of government ought to be turned to their protection at home. At the same time, their *civilization at home* should be sought by measures like those taken with acknowledged success beyond the Mississippi in our days,—just as in other times, very considerable progress was really made by exertions in favour of Indians so far as those exertions were carried, and where

obstacles existed that MIGHT have been removed, even in the midst of the white men's settlements.

Wrong feelings alone in the Americans themselves, in regard to the coloured race, obstruct this course ; and it is those feelings that have led to the second great error alluded to ; namely, the attempt to realize the impossibility of keeping Indians *separate* from white people. Universal experience has proved such impossibility, and suggests that every care should be taken to qualify the Indians for bearing the intercourse which cannot be prevented. The evil of attempting, as the Americans are doing, to keep the races separate, does not end with the attempt being merely fruitless—it renders the wrong feelings which so much require to be conciliated or controlled, uniformly more mischievously obstinate.

The wisest policy is to make intercourse useful, by endeavouring to make *laws* just. What American law is to coloured people has been shown by the disqualification inflicted on their witnesses. If the rule as to the oaths, and other similar points be changed, the progress of the savage will be cleared of incalculable impediments. The course of justice between man and man being thus permitted to become more and more steady, improvement in manners on both sides will gradually follow the equality of legal conditions.

Many more topics might be suggested for legislative and administrative reform, on which we have not left space to expatiate. But the whole subject is at length brought to that practical stage which must present future occasions for reconsidering it. The American people are beginning to treat it as one of real national concern. All that is good in the scheme before us, sprung out of the popular efforts of one individual, the venerable Dr. Morse, who, sixteen years ago, succeeded in forming so numerous a society for obtaining justice for the Indians, that some influential American statesmen opposed him as likely to create a dangerous body that might dictate to the state. Books and documents of all kinds, and in enormous quantities, have been published upon the Indians within the last ten years. The bad parts of the new scheme were strongly opposed, and were only adopted in consequence of the powerful objections made to all other existing systems ; and if in England, as some persons believe, a *better* system than any heretofore devised, is on the eve of being established for the improvement and safety of coloured people, the happy state of our political relations with America may recommend it to a favourable reception there.

ART. VII. BRIEF NOTICE.

The Little Sanctuary: a Series of Domestic Prayers for Morning and Evening during Four Weeks: to which are added Offices for Special Occasions. By the Rev. R. Winter Hamilton. 8vo. London: Hamilton & Co. 1838.

We should be sorry to find that such volumes as the present were in extensive demand. Nevertheless, as there are some who need them, and to whom they may be useful, it is both kind and wise in the Christian minister to furnish them. Mr. Hamilton, in his preface, carefully guards against the supposition of his designing to supersede free prayer. 'My only attempt,' he remarks, 'is to assist those heads of households, who cannot or will not offer free prayer. Compositions of the highest order, the noblest rituals, are imperfect substitutes for its ministration, and doubtful apologies for its neglect.' In such cases his volume will be found useful. It is thoroughly evangelical in sentiment, devout in spirit, extensive in its range, and varied in its topic. If we were to make any exception, it would be to the length of some of the prayers, and to an occasional stiffness and want of ease in their composition. But it is in vain to look, in such a publication, for the simple utterance of the heart, the flowing out of pure and ardent, yet chastened emotion which mark the devotion of the closet. Mr. Hamilton, however, has succeeded to a happy extent; and to such as need the aid he has furnished, we warmly recommend his volume.

ART. VIII. LITERARY INTELLIGENCE.

Just Published.

Life and Administration of Edward, first Earl of Clarendon. With Original Correspondence and Authentic papers never before published. By T. H. Lister, Esq. 3 vols. 8vo.

Lectures on Divine Sovereignty, Election, the Atonement, Justification, and Regeneration. By George Payne, LL.D. Second edition.

Memoir of the Life of Mrs. Hannah More. By W. Roberts, Esq. A new edition, abridged. (Christian's Family Library.)

An Enquiry into the Use of Church Authority, Tradition, and Private Judgment in the Investigation of Revealed Truth. By the Rev. John Moore Capes, B.A. 8vo.

Six Years in Biscay: comprising a Personal Narrative of the Sieges of Bilbao, in June, 1835, and October to December, 1836; and of the Principal Events which occurred in that City and the Basque Provinces, during the years 1830 to 1837. By John Francis Bacon. 8vo.

China; its State and Prospects, with special reference to the spread of the Gospel; containing allusions to the Antiquity, Extent, Population, Civilization, Literature, and Religion of the Chinese. By W. H. Medhurst. 8vo.

The Life and Ministry of the Rev. Samuel Walker, B.A., formerly of Truro, Cornwall. By the Rev. Edwin Sydney, A.M. 2nd. edit., revised and enlarged.

An Analytical and Comparative View of all Religions now extant among Mankind; with their internal diversities of Creed and Profession. By Josiah Conder.

The History, Antiquities, Topography, and Statistics of Eastern India; comprising the districts of Behar, Shahabad, &c., &c., &c., in relation to their Geology, Botany, Agriculture, Commerce, &c., &c., &c. By Montgomery Martin, Author of the 'History of the British Colonies,' &c. 3 vols. Vol. I.

Lectures on Church Establishments. By Thomas Chalmers, D.D.

ERRATA.—Page 567, line 30, for returns read retains.

Page 572, line 37, for Captain Basil read Captain Basil Hall.

Page 572, line 41, for Syria read Styria.